arXiv:1601.01831v1 [math.AP] 8 Jan 2016

Type II blow-up mechanism for supercritical harmonic map heat flow

Paweł Biernat[1,*] and Yukihiro Seki[2,†]

[1] *Institute of Mathematics, University of Bonn.*

[2] *Department of Mathematical Sciences, Faculty of Mathematics, Kyushu University.*

The harmonic map heat flow is a geometric flow well known to produce solutions whose gradient blows up in finite time. A popular model for investigating the blow-up is the heat flow for maps $\mathbb{R}^d \to S^d$, restricted to equivariant maps. This model displays a variety of possible blow-up mechanisms, examples include self-similar solutions for $3 \leq d \leq 6$ and a so-called Type II blow-up in the critical dimension $d = 2$. Here we present the first constructive example of Type II blow-up in higher dimensions: for each $d \geq 7$ we construct a countable family of Type II solutions, each characterized by a different blow-up rate. We study the mechanism behind the formation of these singular solutions and we relate the blow-up to eigenvalues associated to linearization of the harmonic map heat flow around the equatorial map. Some of the solutions constructed by us were already observed numerically.

* pawel.biernat@gmail.com

† seki@math.kyushu-u.ac.jp

I. INTRODUCTION

Given a map $F : M \to N \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ between two Riemannian manifolds M and N one can define a functional

$$E(F) = \frac{1}{2} \int_M |\nabla F|^2 \, dV_M. \tag{1}$$

The critical points of this functional are referred to as harmonic maps and one of the well established procedures used to prove the existence of such objects, called harmonic map flow, was introduced by [4] in the 50's. The basic intuition behind the harmonic map flow is that it is a gradient flow for the functional (1). The partial differential equation governing the harmonic map flow can be concisely expressed as

$$\partial_t F_t = (\Delta F_t)^\top, \quad F_t|_{t=0} = F_0, \tag{2}$$

where $v^\top$ is a projection of $v \in \mathbb{R}^k$ to $T_{F_t}N$ and F_0 is some initial map $F_0 : M \to N$. As long as a solution to (2) stays smooth the value of $E(F_t)$ is decreasing, unless F_t is a stationary point of E, that is a harmonic map. If the solution stays smooth for all times one can recover the homotopy between the initial map F_0 and the limit F_∞, granted it exists, thus proving that there exists a harmonic map in the homotopy class of F_0. This is indeed true if manifold N has everywhere nonpositive sectional curvature, however the claim is false in general.

As in other geometric flows, what prevents the solutions from existing in the long run, even when starting from smooth initial data, is the onset of singularities. In case of the harmonic map flow these singularities take the form of discontinuities in F_t, meaning that right before the singularity the quantity $|\nabla F|$ blows up. One could cope with the singularities by introducing some weak notion of solutions but with the loss of continuity of F_t we also lose the interpretation of F_t as a homotopy. Moreover, there are examples of weak solutions to harmonic map flow, which are smooth before and after the formation of the singularity but lose uniqueness upon transitioning through the singularity. We believe that by studying the mechanisms behind the formation of singularities we might be able to shed some light on this loss of uniqueness. The first step in such analysis is to recover the structure of singular solutions, right before the singularity occurs.

In this paper we consider only a class of maps $F_t : \mathbb{R}^d \to S^d$ (note that S^d is the classical choice for a simple positively curved manifold) for which equation (2) takes a form

$$\partial_t F_t = \Delta F_t + |\nabla F|^2 F_t. \tag{3}$$

Under further restriction of F_t to a 1-equivariant map

$$F_t(r,\omega) = (\cos(u(r,t)), \sin(u(r,t))\omega), \qquad \omega \in S^{d-1} \tag{4}$$

we arrive at

$$\partial_t u = \frac{1}{r^{d-1}}\partial_r \left(r^{d-1}\partial_r u\right) - \frac{d-1}{2r^2}\sin(2u). \tag{5}$$

The boundary conditions depend on the specific formulation of the Cauchy problem for (5), for example demanding that the energy density $|\nabla F_t|$ is finite yields $u(0,t) = 0$ and $\lim_{r\to\infty} u(r,t) = n\pi$ while $\partial_r u(r,t)$ satisfies a certain growth bound at spatial inifinity. In the next section we discuss the conditions for the well-posedness of (5) in detail and show that (5) yields smooth solutions under the sole assumption of $u_0(r)/r$ being bounded (although these solutions do not have, in general, finite initial energy density).

The blow-up in (5) can only occur at $r = 0$ and it manifests itself as

$$\lim_{t\to T} |\partial_r u(0,t)| = \infty$$

for some $T > 0$; likewise the spatial scale associated to the blow-up is given by

$$R(t) := \frac{1}{|\partial_r u(0,t)|}.$$

It is important to distinguish between two cases, depending on how quickly the gradient tends to infinity: if

$$\sup_{t<T} |\sqrt{T-t}\,\partial_r u(0,t)| < \infty,$$

we say that the blow-up is of Type I, otherwise we call it a Type II blow-up. This distinction is firmly connected to the underlying blow-up mechanism, in case of Type I blow-up the solutions are asymptotically, as $t \to T$, self-similar and of the form $u(r,t) = f(r/\sqrt{T-t})$. Conversely, for Type II blow-up the singularity must have a harmonic map at its core, i.e. $u(r,t) = U(r/R(t))$ for $r = \mathcal{O}(R(t))$ with U being the stationary solution to (5). These two blow-up types comprise all possible blow-up scenarios, meaning that there are no blow-up solutions with $\sqrt{T-t}/R(t) \to 0$ as $t \to T$.

Despite a relatively simple formulation, the problem (5) admits a wide range of possible blow-up mechanisms depending on dimension d. For $d = 2$, the generic blow-up is of Type II and it is realized by a shrinking harmonic map containing a finite energy so the blow-up may be viewed as "bubbling" process, where some portion of energy is trapped inside the singularity (see [21] for

a formal approach and [17] for a proof). In higher dimensions, $3 \leq d \leq 6$, there exists a family $(f_n(r/\sqrt{T-t}))_{n=0,1,\dots}$ of self-similar solutions to (5) [5], with f_0 corresponding to the generic blow-up and each next f_n being less stable than the previous one [2], and each corresponding to a Type I blow-up. It is also worth noting that these self-similar solutions can be used to construct the non-unique weak solutions to (5) [2], [6]. So far, the existence of Type II blow-up in dimensions $3 \leq d \leq 6$ has not been ruled out.

In even higher dimensions, $d \geq 7$, there can be no Type I blow-up (Bizoń and Wasserman [3] proved that there are no self-similar solutions to (5)). Instead in [1] one of the authors constructed (non-rigorously) a countable family $(u_n)_{n=0,1,\dots}$ of Type II solutions. This family of solutions display a remarkably similar stability hierarchy to its lower-dimensional self-similar counterpart $(f_n(r/\sqrt{T-t}))_{n=0,1,\dots}$, with u_0 corresponding to a generic blow-up, u_1 being the co-dimension one solution and so on. Here we mimic this construction in a rigorous fashion and prove that representatives of these solutions actually exist.

Theorem I.1. *Fix $d \geq 8$ and $l \geq 1$ or $d = 7$ and $l \geq 2$ and define a real number γ as*

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{2}(d - 2 - \sqrt{d^2 - 8d + 8}).$$

Then there exists a smooth solution u_l to (5) blowing up at time T, which is characterized by a blow-up rate

$$R(t) = \frac{1}{|\partial_r u_l(0,t)|} = (\alpha_l + o(1))(T-t)^{\frac{l}{\gamma}} \qquad \text{as } t \to T \tag{6}$$

with some constant $\alpha_l > 0$. For given d and l there holds $\frac{l}{\gamma} > \frac{1}{2}$, that is in each case the blow-up is of Type II.

Remark I.2. *The peculiar looking condition "$d \geq 8$ and $l \geq 1$ or $d = 7$ and $l \geq 2$" becomes more telling if one writes it as "for any $d \geq 7$ pick $\lambda_l > 0$", where $\{\lambda_l\}$ are eigenvalues of a certain self-adjoint operator introduced later on. The reason for the two cases $d \geq 8$ and $d = 7$ is that in $d = 7$ the eigenvalue λ_1 is equal to zero.*

Remark I.3. *Theorem I.1 is strictly speaking an existence result and we do not claim anything about the blow-up rate of generic solutions nor about the stability of the constructed solutions. There is, however, strong numerical evidence [1] that the solutions constructed by us for $d \geq 8$ and $l = 1$ correspond to the generic blow-up scenario.*

Remark I.4. *Our proof bases on the matched asymptotics method combined with a priri estimates and topological arguments, first developed by Herrero and Velázquez [8]. Later, this method was*

applied to determine the blow-up rates for several parabolic problems with singularity formation; examples include two-dimensional chemotaxis model [9, 22], the problem of ice ball melting [10], the problem of dead core formation [7, 19]. The main advantage of this method is that it directly relates the blow-up rate to spectral information of the linearized operator governing the evolution near the equatorial map $u(r,t) = \pi/2$, thus giving a clear qualitative description of the singular solution in the whole domain $r \geq 0$ (see Theorem IV.2).

II. FORMAL DERIVATION OF THE BLOW-UP RATE

In this section we briefly review the steps from [1] leading to a construction of the family of nonrigorous approximate solutions to (5). Let us define the similarity variables

$$y = \frac{r}{\sqrt{T-t}}, \qquad s = -\log(T-t), \qquad f(y,s) = u(r,t). \tag{7}$$

In similarity variables equation (5) becomes

$$\partial_s f = \partial_{yy} f + \left(\frac{d-1}{y} - \frac{y}{2}\right)\partial_y f - \frac{d-1}{2y^2}\sin(2f), \qquad f(0,s) = 0. \tag{8}$$

with the boundary condition $f(0,s) = 0$ coming from $f(0,s) = u(0,t) = 0$. Numerical experiments suggest that singular solutions to (5) correspond to solutions of (20) converging to $f(y,s) = \frac{\pi}{2}$. So as a first step we linearize the equation (20) around $\frac{\pi}{2}$ by defining a variable ψ such that $f = \frac{\pi}{2} + \psi$. Let us formally write the equation for ψ as

$$\partial_s \psi = -\mathcal{A}\psi + F(\psi) \tag{9}$$

$$F(\phi)(y) = \frac{d-1}{2y^2}(\sin(2\phi(y)) - (2\phi(y))), \tag{10}$$

with the linear part represented by the formal operator $\mathcal{A}$, given by

$$-\mathcal{A}\phi(y) = \frac{1}{\rho}\frac{d}{dy}\left(\rho\frac{d\phi}{dy}(y)\right) + \frac{d-1}{y^2}\phi(y), \qquad \rho = y^{d-1}e^{-\frac{y^2}{4}}. \tag{11}$$

For $d \geq 7$, the (formal) operator $\mathcal{A}$ can be uniquely extended to a proper semibounded self-adjoint operator A acting in some Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ but the details of the functional setup are inessential for the nonrigorous approach, so let us skip them for now. We then pick a positive eigenvalue of A, denoted as $\lambda_l > 0$, and we define a single-mode approximation to (8) as

$$f_{out}(y,s) := \frac{\pi}{2} + a_l(0)e^{-\lambda_l s}\phi_l \tag{12}$$

with ϕ_l being the corresponding eigenvector of A, while $a_l(0)$ is an arbitrary real coefficient (in fact, the matching condition 16 below restricts $a_l(0) < 0$). It is easy to see that $\psi(s,y) = f_{out}(y,s) - \frac{\pi}{2}$

solves the linear part of (9) so it makes for a reasonable first-order approximation. Unfortunately, the eigenfunctions $\{\phi_n\}$ are singular at the origin: $\phi_n(y) \sim y^{-\gamma}$ for some $\gamma > 0$, so $f_{out}(y,s)$ fails to satisfy the boundary condition at the origin $f(0,t) = 0$. The divergence of ϕ_n at the origin is a consequence of us linearizing the equation (8) around a "solution" $f(y,s) = \frac{\pi}{2}$, which fails to satisfy the boundary condition at the origin by itself.

If we consider the region of validity of the linear approximation to be defined by $|f_{out}(s) - \frac{\pi}{2}| \ll 1$, which is equivalent to $y \gg e^{-\frac{\lambda_l}{\gamma}s}$, then we get

$$f(y,s) \approx f_{out}(y,s) = \frac{\pi}{2} + a_l(0)e^{-\lambda_l s}\phi_l, \qquad e^{-\frac{\lambda_l}{\gamma}s} \ll y. \tag{13}$$

Note that the region of validity of ψ_{out} expands towards zero, which implies an existence of a shrinking boundary layer, where the true solution rapidly transitions from the boundary value $f(0,s) = 0$ to $f(y,s) \approx \frac{\pi}{2}$.

To describe this boundary layer we introduce a natural spatial-scale given by the gradient of $f(y,s)$ at the origin

$$\xi = \frac{y}{\varepsilon(s)}, \qquad \varepsilon(s) := \frac{1}{|\partial_y f(0,s)|},$$

so $\varepsilon(s)$ roughly corresponds to the (so far unknown) width of the boundary layer. Let us also define a new variable $U(\xi, s) := f(r,t)$, satisfying

$$\varepsilon^2 \partial_s U = \partial_{\xi\xi} U + \left(\frac{d-1}{\xi} + (2\dot{\varepsilon}\varepsilon - \varepsilon^2)\frac{\xi}{2}\right)\partial_\xi U - \frac{(d+1)}{2\xi^2}\sin(2U), \qquad U(0,s) = 0.$$

Anticipating $\varepsilon(s) \to 0$ as $s \to \infty$ we drop the corresponding terms and arrive at

$$0 = \partial_{\xi\xi} U + \frac{d-1}{\xi}\partial_\xi U - \frac{(d+1)}{2\xi^2}\sin(2U), \qquad U(0,s) = 0 \tag{14}$$

which is effectively an ordinary differential equation (with a unique solution since we fixed the derivative at the origin in the definition of ε and ξ: $\partial_\xi U(0,s) = 1$). Leading to an approximation via stationary solution $U(\xi,s) \approx U_1(\xi)$ and consequently to

$$f(y,s) \approx f_{inn}(y,s) := U_1\left(\frac{y}{\varepsilon(s)}\right). \tag{15}$$

This time the approximation (15) satisfies the boundary condition at the origin. However, the approximation by f_{inn} is also of a limited scope as it works only for $\varepsilon^2\xi \ll 1/\xi$, or equivalently $y \ll 1$. Still, this is enough to construct a global approximation: the region where both approximations ((15) and (12)) are admissible exists for $e^{-\frac{\lambda_l}{\gamma}s} \ll y \ll 1$. This region of two overlapping approximations allows us to compare both of them and make sure they are compatible by picking a specific value of ε.

On one hand, from the asymptotic analysis for the equation (14) for large ξ we get $U_1(\xi) = \pi/2 - h\xi^{-\gamma} + \mathcal{O}(\xi^{-\gamma+2})$, with a positive coefficient $h = h(d)$, so

$$f_{inn}(y,s) \approx \frac{\pi}{2} - h(y/\varepsilon(s))^{-\gamma}, \qquad \epsilon(s) \ll y.$$

On the other hand, we already mentioned that the mode ϕ_1 behaves as $y^{-\gamma}$ near the origin leading to

$$f_{out}(y,s) = \frac{\pi}{2} + a_l(0)e^{-\lambda_l s}\phi_l(y) \approx \frac{\pi}{2} + a_l c_l y^{-\gamma} e^{-\lambda_l s}, \qquad y \ll 1,$$

where we have used $\phi_l(y) = c_l y^{-\gamma} + \mathcal{O}(y^{2-\gamma})$ close to $y = 0$. Demanding that f_{out} matches f_{inn} up to the leading order term, one arrives at the matching condition:

$$\varepsilon(s) \approx \left(\frac{-a_l(0)c_l}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} e^{-\frac{\lambda_l}{\gamma}s}, \tag{16}$$

giving us the innermost spatial scale of the solution, as expected $\varepsilon(s) \to 0$ as $s \to \infty$. But, by definition, ε is related to the gradient at the origin, so we end up with the following blow-up rate

$$\frac{1}{R(t)} = |\partial_r u(0,t)| = \frac{|\partial_y f(0,s)|}{\sqrt{T-t}} = \frac{U_1'(0)}{\varepsilon(s)\sqrt{T-t}} \approx \frac{\kappa}{(T-t)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\lambda_l}{\gamma}}}.$$

In the above formula the constant κ depends on initial only (through $a_l(0)$).

Remark II.1. *The above computations fail for neutral eigenvalues ($\lambda_l = 0$). Naturally, in that case it is necessary to include the interaction coming from the nonlinear term, which leads to logarithmic corrections to the blow-up rate. In this paper we deal only with the blow-up rates coming from the strictly positive eigenvalues, so we don't go into detail how to derive the blow-up rates when $\lambda_l = 0$, instead an interested reader is referred to [1].*

In this paper we prove that one can find an initial data, leading to smooth solutions to (5) blowing up at time T with the blow-up rate

$$R(t) \approx (T-t)^{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\lambda_l}{\gamma}}, \tag{17}$$

where λ_l stands for any positive eigenvalue of the operator A. Replacing λ_l with its explicit value $\lambda_l = -\frac{\gamma}{2} + l$ (see Lemma III.4) and incorporating the condition $\lambda_l > 0$, we arrive at the blow-up rate stated in Theorem I.1.

III. PRELIMINARIES

The initial data that we use in our construction is discontinuous, thus we have to prove a well-posedness of the Cauchy problem (5) in the relevant space of discontinuous functions. Establishing such a result is only possible thanks to the equivariant symmetry the ansatz (4), which ensures that the singularity can only occur at the origin, and discontinuities at other points $r > 0$ will simply be smoothed out by the heat kernel. In particular, the Lemma below implies that the Cauchy problem (5) is well posed even for initial data with infinite initial Dirichlet energy. For comparison, the proof well-posedness for general maps F without any symmetry assumptions requires slightly larger regularity of initial data: $\|\nabla F_0\|_\infty < \infty$ (this result was first derived by [4], see also [11] or [20] for more modern and concise approaches). The discontinuity of our initial data, however, does not play any essential role in our argument; it simply removes the necessity of introducing smoothed out indicator functions and therefore simplifies computations.

The first part of this section is devoted to restating (5) as a proper Cauchy problem and to showing its well-posedness and some estimates on a solution u in Proposition III.1. Then, we take a closer look at the singular solution $\pi/2$ that we already used to derive a non-rigorous blow-up rate. We show that any solution u from Proposition III.1 can be interpreted as a classical solution in a Hilbert space arising from studying the linear stability of the solution $\pi/2$.

Proposition III.1. *Assume that* $K := \sup_{r\geq 0}|u_0(r)/r| < \infty$*, then there is* $t_1(u_0) > 0$ *such that there exists a unique solution* $u \in C^\infty((0,t_1]\times[0,\infty))$ *to* (105) *fulfilling*

$$|\partial_r^{(n)}\partial_t^{(k)}(u(r,t)/r)| \leq c_{n,k}(t,K) < \infty, \qquad t \in (0,t_1] \tag{18a}$$

$$\lim_{t\to 0+} u(r,t) = u_0(r) \ \ a.e. \tag{18b}$$

Proof. The linearization of (5) around $u = 0$,

$$\partial_t u = \partial_{rr}u + \frac{d-1}{r}\partial_r u - \frac{d-1}{r^2}u,$$

contains a singular potential term $\frac{d-1}{2r^2}$. As our first step we get rid of this singular term by introducing a new variable $\Phi(r,t) = u(r,t)/r$. Consequently, the Cauchy problem (5) in terms of Φ becomes

$$\partial_t\Phi = \Delta\Phi + \mathcal{F}(\Phi), \qquad \Phi(r,0) = \Phi_0(r) = \frac{u_0(r)}{r}, \qquad r \in [0,\infty) \tag{19}$$

with Δ denoting the radial part of Laplacian on $\mathbb{R}^{d+2}$ and $\mathcal{F}(\Phi)$ standing for the nonlinear part

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}(\Phi) &= -\frac{d-1}{2r^3}\sin(2r\Phi) + \frac{d-1}{r^2}\Phi \\ &= 4(d-1)\Phi^3\left(\frac{(2r\Phi)-\sin(2r\Phi)}{(2r\Phi)^3}\right).\end{aligned}$$

The last formula reveals that the nonlinear term behaves much better than it looks: it is smooth in both r and Φ, it is bounded by $|\mathcal{F}(\Phi)|\lesssim \Phi^3$ independently of r and positive $F(\Phi)>0$ for positive Φ (note that we write "$A\lesssim B$" if $A\leq CB$ with some inessential constant $C>0$).

Slightly abusing the notation, let us extend the notion of Φ to a function on $\Phi(x,t):\mathbb{R}^{d+2}\times[0,t_1)$ with $x\in\mathbb{R}^{d+2}$ such that $r=|x|$. The nonlinear term is smooth and therefore locally Lipschitz in L^∞ norm, so the general results for parabolic equations (see e.g. [12] Proposition 7.3.1 or [13] Section 6.3) imply that for every $\Phi_0\in L^\infty$ (equivalently for every u_0 such that $u_0(r)/r$ is bounded) there is $t_1>0$ such that a unique mild solution to (19) exists for $t\in(0,t_1)$ with Φ, $\partial_t\Phi$, $\nabla_x\Phi$, $\Delta\Phi$ continuous as functions on $\mathbb{R}^{d+2}\times(0,t_1)$. By a mild solution we understand an L^∞ solution to the integral equation

$$\Phi(t,\cdot) = S(t)\Phi_0(\cdot) + \int_0^t S(t-s)\mathcal{F}(\Phi(s,\cdot))\,ds, \qquad t\in(0,t_1), \tag{20}$$

with $S(t):L^\infty\to L^\infty$ being the heat semigroup generated by the Laplacian

$$S(t)\psi(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+2}} G(x-y,t)\psi(y)\,dy, \qquad G(x,t)=\frac{1}{(4\pi t)^{(d+2)/2}}e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{4t}}.$$

The smoothness and estimates (18a) follow directly from taking derivatives of (20) and moving them under the integral sign followed by taking the L^∞ norm of the result.

As for (18b), we combine a classical result that $S(t)\Phi_0\to\Phi_0$ almost everywhere as $t\to 0$ with the following bound on the nonlinear term:

$$\left|\int_0^t S(t-s)\mathcal{F}(\Phi(s,\cdot))\,ds\right| \leq \int_0^t S(t-s)(\Phi(s,\cdot))^3\,ds \leq t\sup_{s\in(0,t_1)}\|\Phi(s,\cdot)\|_\infty^3.$$

The latter ensures that the nonlinear term tends uniformly to zero as $t\to 0$. □

Remark III.2. *A classical result on second order parabolic equations (cf. for instance, [16]) implies that the comparison principle holds for Φ. In consequence, a comparison principle holds also for u and f. This will be of great use in Section IV.*

As demonstrated in the previous section the linear stability analysis of the (singular) stationary solution $f(y,s)=\frac{\pi}{2}$ can be used to derive the blow-up rate and other quantitative properties of

blow-up solutions. Therefore it seems natural to analyze the original problem (5) using the following similarity variables

$$y = \frac{r}{\sqrt{T-t}}, \qquad s = -\log(T-t), \qquad \psi(s)(y) = u(r,t) - \frac{\pi}{2}, \tag{21}$$

so that $\psi(s) = 0$ corresponds to $f(y,s) = \frac{\pi}{2}$. In self-similar variables (21) equation (5) becomes

$$\psi'(s) = -\mathcal{A}\psi(s) + F(\psi(s)) \tag{22}$$

$$F(\phi)(y) = \frac{d-1}{2y^2}(\sin(2\phi(y)) - (2\phi(y))), \tag{23}$$

with the formal operator $\mathcal{A}$ defined as

$$-\mathcal{A}\phi(y) = \frac{1}{\rho}\frac{d}{dy}\left(\rho\frac{d\phi}{dy}(y)\right) + \frac{d-1}{y^2}\phi(y), \tag{24}$$

$$\rho = y^{d-1}e^{-\frac{y^2}{4}}. \tag{25}$$

It remains to restate the formal problem (22) in a concrete Banach space (or in this case, Hilbert space). The Sturm-Liouville form of $\mathcal{A}$ suggests to consider the Hilbert space

$$\mathcal{H} := L^2([0,\infty), \rho\, dy) = \left\{ f \in L^2_{loc} \,|\, \int_0^\infty f(y)^2 \rho\, dy \right\}.$$

with the standard scalar product

$$\langle f, g\rangle = \int_0^\infty f(y)g(y)\rho\, dy$$

and a norm denoted as $\|\cdot\| = \sqrt{\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle}$.

As we shall see later on, the space $\mathcal{H}$ was chosen to fulfill two conditions: the operator $-\mathcal{A}$ can be represented as a semi-bounded symmetric operator that has a self-adjoint extension. To prove these two results we need the following Hardy-type inequality.

Lemma III.3. *For $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$ we have*

$$\int_0^\infty \left(\phi'(y)\right)^2 \rho dy + \left(\alpha^2 - (d-2)\,\alpha\right)\int_0^\infty \frac{\phi(y)^2}{y^2}\rho dy \geq -\frac{\alpha}{2}\int_0^\infty \phi(y)^2\rho dy. \tag{26}$$

Proof. We first notice that

$$0 \leq \left(\phi' + \frac{\alpha\phi}{y}\right)^2 = (\phi')^2 + \frac{\alpha}{r}(\phi^2)' + \frac{\alpha^2\phi^2}{y^2}.$$

Integration over $[0,\infty)$ with weight ρ gets us to

$$0 \leq \int_0^\infty \left(\phi'\right)^2 \rho dy + \alpha\int_0^\infty \frac{\left(\phi^2\right)'}{y}\rho dy + \alpha^2\int_0^\infty \frac{\phi^2}{y^2}\rho dy.$$

Integration by parts applied to the middle term on the right hand side transforms it to

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{\left(\phi^2\right)'}{y}\rho dy = -\int_0^\infty \left(\frac{d-2}{y^2} - \frac{1}{2}\right)\phi^2 \rho dy.$$

Rearranging the terms we arrive at (26). □

The inequality (26) implies that for any $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$ the operator $-\mathcal{A}$ with $D(\mathcal{A}) := C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$ is bounded from below. To see that we rewrite $\langle \mathcal{A}\phi, \phi\rangle$, using its Sturm-Liouville form (24), as

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathcal{A}\phi, \phi\rangle &= \int_0^\infty \left(\phi'(y)\right)^2 \rho dy - (d-1)\int_0^\infty \frac{\phi(y)^2}{y^2}\rho dy \\ &\geq -\left(\alpha^2 - (d-2)\,\alpha + (d-1)\right)\int_0^\infty \frac{\phi(y)^2}{y^2}\rho dy - \frac{\alpha}{2}\int_0^\infty \phi(y)^2 \rho dy. \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

The quadratic equation

$$\alpha^2 - (d-2)\alpha + (d-1) = 0, \tag{28}$$

has real roots for $d \geq 4 + 2\sqrt{2} \approx 6.828$, so by defining γ as the smaller root

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{2}(d - 2 - \omega), \qquad \omega = \sqrt{d^2 - 8d + 8} \tag{29}$$

and picking $\alpha = \gamma$ we get the the lower bound

$$\langle \mathcal{A}\psi, \psi\rangle \geq -\frac{\gamma}{2}\|\psi\|^2. \tag{30}$$

Moreover, it is easy to see that $\mathcal{A}$ is symmetric on $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$, so by a standard result on symmetric semi-bounded operators it admits a unique Friedrichs extension to a self-adjoint operator (see e.g. [18], Theorem X.23). It is also routine to compute the eigenvectors and eigenvalues of this Friedrichs extension. We summarize these results in Lemma III.4.

Lemma III.4. *For $d > 4 + 2\sqrt{2}$ the operator $\mathcal{A}$ with domain $D(\mathcal{A}) := C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$ can be extended to a semibounded self-adjoint operator A with domain $D(A)$. The operator A satisfies the same lower bound as $\mathcal{A}$ and the spectrum of A consists of countably many simple eigenvalues. These eigenvalues and eigenvectors are given by*

$$\lambda_n = -\frac{\gamma}{2} + n, \qquad \phi_n(y) = \mathcal{N}_n y^{-\gamma} L_n^{(\omega/2)}\left(\frac{y^2}{4}\right), \qquad n \geq 0, \tag{31}$$

where $L_n^{(\alpha)}$ denotes the generalized Laguerre polynomial of order n. The normalization constant

$$\mathcal{N}_n = \sqrt{\frac{\Gamma(1+n)}{\Gamma(1+n+\omega/2)}}$$

ensures that $\|\phi_n\| = 1$*, while the asymptotic expansion of* $L_n^{(\alpha)}$ *yields the following behavior for* ϕ_n *at* 0 *and* ∞*, respectively:*

$$\phi_n(y) = \alpha_n y^{-\gamma} + \mathcal{O}(y^{-\gamma+2}), \tag{32a}$$

$$\phi_n(y) = \beta_n y^{2\lambda_l} + \mathcal{O}(y^{2\lambda_l-2}) = \beta_n y^{-\gamma} y^{2l} + \mathcal{O}(y^{2\lambda_l-2}). \tag{32b}$$

The coefficients α_n *and* β_n *are given [15] by*

$$\alpha_n = \frac{1}{\Gamma(1+\omega/2)}\sqrt{\frac{\Gamma(1+n+\omega/2)}{\Gamma(1+n)}} \approx n^{\omega/4}$$

$$\beta_n = 4^{-n}\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Gamma(1+n)\Gamma(1+n+\omega/2)}} \approx \frac{n^{-\omega/4}4^{-n}}{n!}$$

with their behavior for large n *denoted by '*$\approx$*'.*

With the Hilbert space and the self-adjoint operator $A : D(A) \subset \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ at hand we are ready to rephrase the problem (22) as a proper Cauchy problem in $\mathcal{H}$

$$\begin{aligned} \psi'(s) &= -A\psi(s) + F(\psi(s)), \qquad s > s_0, \\ \psi(0) &= \psi_0 \in \mathcal{H}. \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

(from here on we let $s_0 = -\log(T)$). On one hand, the well-posedness for Cauchy problem (33) is still open and, in fact, (33) might be prone to non-unique solutions (c.f. non-unique weak solutions found for $2 < d < 4 + 2\sqrt{2}$ in [2] or [6]). On the other hand, we already established a different well-posedness result in Proposition III.1. In the remainder of this section we show that a solution $u(r,t)$ from Proposition III.1, translated to self-similar variables as a function

$$\psi_u(s)(y) := \begin{cases} u(r,t) - \frac{\pi}{2} & s > s_0 \\ u_0(r) - \frac{\pi}{2} & s = s_0, \end{cases} \tag{34}$$

can be regarded a classical solution to (33) with initial data $\psi_0 = \psi_u(s_0)$. For the proof of this statement and the definition of a classical solution we refer to Lemma III.6 below. Once we establish that ψ_u is indeed a classical solution to (33) we immediately get the following corollary (see for example [12] or [13]).

Corollary III.5. *Given initial data* $\psi_0(y) = u_0(r) - \frac{\pi}{2}$ *with* $|u_0(r)/r|$ *bounded, the Cauchy problem* (33) *has a unique classical solution* ψ_u *defined in* (34)*. The classical solution* ψ_u *solves the integral equation*

$$\psi_u(s) = e^{-(s-s_0)A}\psi_u(s_0) + \int_{s_0}^{s} e^{-(s-\tau)A}F(\psi_u(\tau))\,d\tau, \qquad s \geq s_0 \tag{35}$$

where $e^{-sA} : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ is the C_0-semigroup generated by $-A$ and given explicitly as

$$e^{-sA}v = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda_n s}\langle v, \phi_n\rangle \phi_n, \qquad s > 0$$

for any $v \in \mathcal{H}$.

So, although we do not prove the well-posedness of (33) we can still employ the formula (35). There are several benefits that we gain by reformulating (5) as (35). First of all, we gain the notion of continuity in $\mathcal{H}$ starting from $s = s_0$, which corresponds to $t = 0$. This is an improvement compared to u being continuous in L^∞ only for $t > 0$, in other words we have $u \in C((0, t_1], L^\infty)$ but $\psi_u \in C([s_0, s_1], \mathcal{H})$. Secondly, we are able to explicitly use eigenvalues of A in a priori estimates on ψ_u. And finally, the heat kernel associated to the semigroup e^{-sA} is known in an explicit form and its action can be bounded by maximal functions (cf. Lemma VI.2 further on). We devote the rest of this section to proving that (34) is, in fact, a classical solution to (33).

Lemma III.6. *The function ψ_u defined in* (33) *is a classical solution to* (33)*, that is*

$$\psi_u \in C([s_0, s_1], \mathcal{H}) \cap C((s_0, s_1], D(A)) \cap C^1((s_0, s_1], \mathcal{H}) \tag{36}$$

(with $s_1 = -\log(T - t_1)$) and

$$(s \to F(\psi_u(s))) \in C([s_0, s_1], \mathcal{H}) \cap L^1([s_0, s_1], \mathcal{H}) \tag{37}$$

and finally ψ_u solves $\psi_u'(s) = -A\psi_u(s) + F(\psi_u(s))$ for $s > s_0$.

Proof. We already showed that u is smooth and solves (5) thus, by construction, ψ_u solves $\psi_u'(s) = -A\psi_u(s) + F(\psi_u(s))$ for $s > s_0$, so it remains to confirm the appropriate continuity conditions (36) and (37).

To this end, we note that (18a) from Proposition III.1 implies that for any fixed $t > 0$ all derivatives of u are bounded near the origin and have at most linear growth for large r

$$|\partial_t^{(n)}\partial_r^{(k)}u(r, t)| \lesssim 1 + r, \qquad t > 0.$$

These bounds carry over to bounds on derivatives of ψ_u for fixed $s > s_0$ (possibly with different $\beta_{n,k}$)

$$|\psi_u(s)(y)| \lesssim 1 + y, \qquad |\partial_y\psi_u(s)(y)| \lesssim 1 + y,$$
$$|\partial_{yy}\psi_u(s)(y)| \lesssim 1 + y, \qquad |\partial_s\psi_u(s)(y)| \lesssim 1 + y^2,$$

(the additional power for the time derivative ∂_s comes from the last term in $\partial_s = e^{-s}\partial_t + \frac{1}{2}r\partial_r$). Now, the action of A on $\psi_u(s)$ can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}|A\psi_u(s)(y)| &= \left|\partial_{yy}\psi(s)(y) + \left(\frac{d-1}{y} - \frac{y}{2}\right)\partial_y\psi_u(s)(y) + \frac{d-1}{y^2}\psi_u(s)(y)\right| \\ &\lesssim y^{-2} + y^2.\end{aligned}$$

From the above we deduce that the norm

$$\|A\psi_u(s)\|^2 \lesssim \int_0^\infty \left(y^{-2} + y^2\right)^2 y^{d-1} e^{-\frac{y^2}{4}}\, dy$$

is finite, thus $\psi_u(s) \in D(A) \subset \mathcal{H}$ for $s > s_0$. In a completely analogous fashion one can show that $\psi_u'(s), F(\psi_u(s)) \in \mathcal{H}$ for $s > s_0$. At this point the continuity for $s > s_0$ follows from smoothness of $\psi_u(s)(y)$ in s and y for $s > s_0$ and the dominated convergence theorem.

We therefore established that (36) and (37) hold on the interval $(s_0, s_1]$. To finalize the proof we note that by (18b) $u(r,t) \to u_0(r)$ for $t \to 0$ almost everywhere, thus $\psi_u(s)(y) \to \psi_u(s_0)$ almost everywhere when $s \to s_0$. So it suffices to show that $\psi_u(s_0)$ and $F(\psi_u(s_0))$ are in $\mathcal{H}$ and apply the dominated convergence theorem. Indeed, for $|u_0(r)/r|$ bounded we have $|\psi_u(s_0)| \lesssim 1 + y$, which implies $\psi_u(s_0), F(\psi_u(s_0)) \in \mathcal{H}$ and the continuity at s_0 follows. □

IV. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULT

In this section we construct a solution to (5) that blows up at time $t = T$, or equivalently a solution to (33) defined for all times $s \geq s_0$. This construction is based on the matched asymptotics method used to construct a formal solution and requires the approximations derived in Section II. The basic idea is to take initial data that is already close to the formal solution and fine tune it using a finite number of parameters so that it stays close to the anticipated formal solution for as long as we like. We use the initial time s_0 as a "bettering" parameter, that is by taking s_0 large enough our initial data gets closer to the formal solution taken at time s_0; let us also remind that $s_0 = -\log(T)$, so taking s_0 large corresponds to a small blow-up time T.

First, let us remind that the inner part of the approximation was based on the solution U_1 to the ordinary differential equation

$$U''(r) + \frac{d-1}{r}U'(r) - \frac{d-1}{2r^2}\sin(2U) = 0, \qquad U(0) = 0 \tag{38}$$

with initial condition $U_1'(0) = 1$; naturally $u(r,t) = U_\alpha(r)$ is a stationary solution to (5). Thanks to the scaling symmetry $r \to \lambda r$ of (38), U_1 gives rise to solutions U_α for all $\alpha > 0$ by simply defining

$U_\alpha(r) := U_1(\alpha r)$. Lemma IV.1 below establishes the basic properties of U_α. We do not prove it here but the proof can be found in the Appendix of [1] and it consists of the phase portrait analysis of the autonomous equation $v''(x)+(d-2)v'(x)+(d-2)\sin(v(x))=0$ arising after changing variables to $x=\log(r)$ and $v(x)=U(r)$.

Lemma IV.1. *For $d > 4+2\sqrt{2}$, there exists a family of solutions $U_\alpha(r) = U_1(\alpha r)$, (with $\alpha > 0$) to equation* (38) *such that*

$$U_\alpha(0) = 0, \quad U'_\alpha(0) = \alpha.$$

Moreover U_α is monotone

$$U'_\alpha(r) > 0, \qquad r > 0 \tag{39}$$

and its asymptotic behavior for large r is

$$U_\alpha(r) = \frac{\pi}{2} - h\,\alpha^\gamma r^{-\gamma} + \mathcal{O}(r^{-\gamma-2}), \tag{40}$$

where h is a strictly positive constant depending only on d and γ is the constant given by (29).

Now let us fix α to be

$$\alpha := \left(\frac{\alpha_l}{h}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}$$

and define the following constants

$$0 < \widetilde{k} < k < 1, \qquad 0 < \widetilde{\sigma} < \sigma < \frac{1}{2},$$
$$\omega_l := \frac{\lambda_l}{\gamma}, \qquad K := e^{k\omega_l s_0}, \qquad \widetilde{K} := e^{\widetilde{k}\omega_l s_0}$$

(note that $K \gg \widetilde{K} \gg 1$ for $s_0 \gg 1$). The constants k, σ and $\widetilde{\sigma}$ will be further restricted in Lemma VI.5, Lemma VI.7 and Lemma VI.8 but the upshot is that the constant k should be taken close to 1, while σ and $\widetilde{\sigma}$ should be chosen close to 0. We can now take $q = (q_0, q_2, \ldots, q_{l-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^l$ and a function $\psi_{0,q}$, which will serve as the initial data, such that

$$\psi_{0,q}(y) = U_\alpha(ye^{\omega_l s_0}) - \frac{\pi}{2} \qquad y \in [0, \widetilde{K}e^{-\omega_l s_0}) \tag{41a}$$

$$\psi_{0,q}(y) = \sum_{n=0}^{l-1} q_n \phi_n(y) - e^{-\lambda_l s_0}\phi_l(y) \qquad y \in [\widetilde{K}e^{-\omega_l s_0}, e^{\widetilde{\sigma} s_0}) \tag{41b}$$

$$|\psi_{0,q}(y)| \le \frac{\pi}{2} \qquad y \in [e^{\widetilde{\sigma} s_0}, \infty). \tag{41c}$$

One can immediately notice that with $q = 0$ the second part of the definition (41) corresponds to the formal approximation we made in (12) with $a_l(0) = -1$, while the first part is just (15) with $\varepsilon(s)$ coming from (16) (the two parts meet divided at $y = \widetilde{K}e^{-\omega_l s} \ll 1$). The parameters q in (41) stand in front of the modes of lower-order than ϕ_l. The presence of the third term (41c) is due to the polynomial growth of ϕ_n at infinity, which we have to cut off at some point to produce a bounded solution, that is $u(r,t)$ enclosed in a strip $0 \le u(r,t) \le \pi$.

As a matter of fact, function $\psi_{0,q}$ is discontinuous but it is easy to see that the associated $u_{0,q}(r) := \psi_{0,q}(y) + \frac{\pi}{2} = \psi_{0,q}(e^{-s_0/2}r) + \frac{\pi}{2}$ fulfills the assumptions of Corollary III.5, thus a solution to (33) with initial data $\psi_{0,q}$ exists for some short time $s_1 > s_0$. From now on, we shall refer to a solution to (33) with initial data $\psi_{0,q}$ as ψ_q.

Let us now define a property of solution ψ_q, which serves as the basis of our topological argument. We say that ψ_q has the property $\mathcal{W}^{\theta}_{s_0,s_1}$ (or $\psi_q \in \mathcal{W}^{\theta}_{s_0,s_1}$ for short) if the following estimate holds for $s_0 \le s \le s_1$

$$|\psi_q(s)(y) + e^{-\lambda_l s}\phi_l(y)| < \theta\eta e^{-\lambda_l s}(y^{-\gamma} + y^{2\lambda_l}) \qquad \text{for } Ke^{-\omega_l s} \le y \le e^{\sigma s} \tag{42}$$

The parameter $\eta \in (0, \alpha_l)$ should be treated as a fixed number, chosen for the remainder of this paper according to Lemma IV.2 below. Basing on the definition of $\mathcal{W}^{\theta}_{s_0,s_1}$ we define the following subset of $\mathbb{R}^l$

$$\mathcal{U}_{s_0,s_1} := \left\{ q \in \mathbb{R}^l \,:\, \psi_q \in \mathcal{W}^1_{s_0,s_1} \right\} \cap B_{e^{-\lambda_l s_0}}(0). \tag{43}$$

It turns out that having $q \in \mathcal{U}_{s_0,s_1}$ provides sufficient information to ensure that the solution ψ_q is close to a re-scaled stationary solution near the origin and stays bounded in the external region $y > e^{\sigma s}$ in the sense of the following Lemma.

Lemma IV.2. *Take $\delta \in (0,1)$ and $\eta = \eta(\delta) > 0$ small enough. Then for any $q \in \mathcal{U}_{s_0,s_1}$ and $s_0 \le s \le s_1$ we have*

$$U_{\alpha\delta}(ye^{\omega_l s}) - \frac{\pi}{2} < \psi_q(s)(y) < U_{\alpha/\delta}(ye^{\omega_l s}) - \frac{\pi}{2} \qquad y \in [0, Ke^{-\omega_l s}) \tag{44a}$$

$$|\psi_q(s)(y) + e^{-\lambda_l s}\phi_l(y)| < \eta e^{-\lambda_l s}(y^{-\gamma} + y^{2\lambda_l}) \qquad y \in [Ke^{-\omega_l s}, e^{\sigma s}) \tag{44b}$$

$$|\psi_q(s)(y)| \le \frac{\pi}{2} \qquad y \in [e^{\sigma s, \infty}), \tag{44c}$$

provided that s_0 is large enough.

Proof. Estimate (44b) follows directly from the definition of $\mathcal{W}^1_{s_0,s_1}$. According to Lemma IV.4 below, if we pick $\eta < \alpha_l(\delta^{-\gamma} - 1)$ and s_0 large enough then (44a) must hold. It remains to show

(44c) but this is a straight forward implication of maximum principle. Namely, from (41c) it follows that

$$|\psi_q(s_0)(y)| \leq \frac{\pi}{2},$$

while at the boundary $y = e^{\sigma s}$ of the outer region we have

$$|\psi_q(s)|_{y=e^{\sigma s}} \sim e^{-\lambda_l s}(e^{\sigma s})^{2\lambda_l} = e^{-(1-2\sigma)\lambda_l s} \leq e^{-(1-2\sigma)\lambda_l s_0} \ll 1$$

as long as s_0 is large enough. If we now notice that $\psi(s)(y) = \pm\frac{\pi}{2}$ are exact solutions to (33), the maximum principle implies that the solution ψ_q is confined to the strip $|\psi_q(s)(y)| \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$. □

Let us define a map

$$P_{s_0,s_1}(q) := (\langle\psi_q(\cdot, s_1), \phi_0\rangle, \ldots, \langle\psi_q(\cdot, s_1), \phi_{l-1}\rangle) \tag{45}$$

which is analytic as a map $P_{s_0,s_1} : \mathcal{U}_{s_0,s_1} \to \mathbb{R}^l$ (via analytic dependence on initial data). The set $\mathcal{U}_{s_0,s_1}$ was defined in such a way that the roots of P_{s_0,s_1} can never cross the boundary of $\mathcal{U}_{s_0,s_1}$.

Lemma IV.3. *If s_0 is large enough and $q \in \mathcal{U}_{s_0,s_1}$ is a root of P_{s_0,s_1} (i.e. $P_{s_0,s_1}(q) = 0$) for some $s_1 > s_0$, then $q \notin \partial\mathcal{U}_{s_0,s_1}$.*

Proof. Sections VI and VII of this paper consist of a series of Lemmas that altogether guarantee that if $P_{s_0,s_1}(q) = 0$ then for any $\nu \in (0, 1)$ we can choose $s_0 \gg 1$ large enough so that

$$|\psi_q(s)(y) + e^{-\lambda_l s}\phi_l(y)| \leq \nu e^{-\lambda_l s}(y^{-\gamma} + y^{2\lambda_l}) \qquad Ke^{-\omega_l s} \leq y \leq e^{\sigma s}. \tag{46}$$

In addition to that result Lemma V.4 shows that any root of P_{s_0,s_1} lies close to the origin in a sense that $q \in B_{\varepsilon e^{-\lambda_l s_0}}(0)$ for some $\varepsilon \ll 1$. □

The proof of Theorem 1.1. The above Lemma is crucial in applying the following topological argument . Lemma IV.3 and the general homotopy principle guarantee that the degree of zero is conserved:

$$\deg(P_{s_0,s_1}, \mathcal{U}_{s_0,s_1}, 0) = \deg(P_{s_0,s_0}, \mathcal{U}_{s_0,s_0}, 0)$$

as long as $\mathcal{U}_{s_0,s} \neq \emptyset$ for any $s_0 \leq s \leq s_1$. A direct computation uncovers that P_{s_0,s_0} is a small perturbation of identity, provided that $s_0 \gg 1$, so

$$\deg(P_{s_0,s_1}, \mathcal{U}_{s_0,s_1}, 0) = \deg(P_{s_0,s_0}, \mathcal{U}_{s_0,s_0}, 0) = 1.$$

This leads to a conclusion that as long as $\mathcal{U}_{s_0,s_1} \neq \emptyset$ it must contain a root of P_{s_0,s_1}.

By continuous dependence of solutions on initial data, we also claim that $\mathcal{U}_{s_0,s_1} \neq \emptyset$ if s_0 is sufficiently large. Assume now that maximal time of existence of the set $\mathcal{U}_{s_0,s}$ is finite, i.e.

$$s^* = \sup\{s > s_0 \,:\, \mathcal{U}_{s_0,s} \neq \emptyset\} < \infty.$$

The set U_{s_0,s^*} is nonempty and thus it contains a root P_{s_0,s^*} but for any such root (say we call it q^*) we must have $\psi_{q^*} \in \mathcal{W}^{\theta}_{s_0,s^*}$ for $0 < \theta < 1$. But from smoothness of ψ_{q^*}, we deduce that $\psi_{q^*} \in \mathcal{W}^{1}_{s_0,s^*+\eta}$ for some $\eta > 0$, which contradicts $s^* < \infty$.

At this point, $\mathcal{U}_{s_0,\infty} \neq \emptyset$ along with Lemma IV.2, imply our main theorem I.1. Indeed, from (44a) and $ye^{s\omega_l} = r(T-t)^{l/\gamma}$ we have

$$U_{\alpha\delta}(r/(T-t)^{l/\gamma}) < u(r,t) < U_{\alpha/\delta}(r/(T-t)^{l/\gamma})$$

for r sufficiently close to the origin. If we now divide by r and take the limit $r \to 0$ (mind that $u(0,t) = 0$ and $u(r,t)$ is smooth for $t > 0$) and apply $U'_{\alpha}(0) = \alpha$ we get

$$\alpha\delta(T-t)^{-l/\gamma} \leq \partial_r u(0,t) \leq \alpha/\delta(T-t)^{-l/\gamma}.$$

This last estimate yields

$$\frac{1}{\partial_r u(0,t)} \propto (T-t)^{l/\gamma},$$

which is just the blow-up rate that we claimed.

We complete this section with the proof of a priori estimates for the inner layer.

Lemma IV.4. *For any $0 < \delta < 1$ and $\eta < \alpha_l(\delta^{-\gamma} - 1)$ the bound*

$$|\psi_q(s)(y) + e^{-\lambda_l s}\phi_l(y)| < \eta e^{-\lambda_l s}(y^{-\gamma} + y^{2\lambda_l}), \qquad Ke^{\omega_l s} \leq y \leq e^{\sigma s} \tag{47}$$

for $s_0 \leq s \leq s_1$ implies

$$U_{\alpha\delta}(ye^{\omega_l s}) - \frac{\pi}{2} < \psi_q(s)(y) < U_{\alpha/\delta}(ye^{\omega_l s}) - \frac{\pi}{2}, \qquad 0 \leq y \leq Ke^{-\omega_l s} \tag{48a}$$

for $s_0 \leq s \leq s_1$, provided that s_0 is taken sufficiently large.

Proof. In this proof, we always assume that $0 \leq \xi \leq K$, we also remind that $K = e^{k\omega_l s_0}$ can be made arbitrarily large by taking large s_0. Rewriting the equation (33) in inner variables ($\xi := ye^{\omega_l s}$ and $\Phi(\xi, s) = \psi_q(s)(y) + \frac{\pi}{2}$) leads to

$$0 = \mathcal{U}(\Phi) := \partial_s\Phi + \left(\frac{1}{2} + \omega_l\right)\xi\partial_\xi\Phi - e^{2\omega_l s}\left(\partial_{\xi\xi}\Phi + \frac{d-1}{\xi}\partial_\xi\Phi - \frac{d-1}{2\xi^2}\sin(2\Psi)\right).$$

The initial data $\psi_{0,q}$ translate to

$$\Phi(\xi, s_0) = U_\alpha(\xi), \tag{49}$$

while the bounds (47), along with $\phi_l(y) \approx \alpha_l y^{-\gamma}$ near the origin, lead to the following estimate at the boundary, $\xi = K$,

$$\frac{\pi}{2} - (\alpha_l + \eta)K^{-\gamma} \leq \Phi(K, s) \leq \frac{\pi}{2} - (\alpha_l - \eta)K^{-\gamma} \tag{50}$$

up to the leading order in K (mind that by taking s_0 large enough we can make these higher order terms arbitrarily small), where we have used the asymptotics of eigenfunctions (32a).

Substituting $\overline{\Phi}(\xi, s) := U_{\alpha/\delta}(\xi)$ leads to

$$\mathcal{U}(\overline{\Phi}) = \left(\frac{1}{2} + \omega_l\right) \xi U'_{\alpha/\delta}(\xi) \geq 0, \tag{51}$$

which makes $\overline{\Phi}(\xi, s)$ a natural candidate for a supersolution. It remains to verify that it fulfills the respective inequalities involving initial and boundary conditions in the region $0 \leq \xi \leq K$. The monotonicity of U_α (see inequality (39)) immediately leads to

$$\Phi(\xi, s_0) = U_\alpha(\xi) \leq U_{\alpha/\delta}(\xi) = \overline{\Phi}(\xi),$$

On the other hand, the asymptotics of $U_{\alpha/\delta}(\xi)$ as $\xi \to \infty$ yields

$$\overline{\Phi}(K, s) = \frac{\pi}{2} - h(\alpha/\delta)^\gamma K^{-\gamma}.$$

Comparing this with (50), we get $\overline{\Phi}(K, s) > \Phi(K, s)$ if

$$0 < \eta < \alpha_l \left(1 - \delta^\gamma\right), \tag{52}$$

which makes $\overline{\Phi}(\xi, s)$ a supersolution. In terms of ψ_q this means that

$$\psi_q(s)(y) \leq \overline{\Phi}(\xi, s) - \frac{\pi}{2} = U_{\alpha/\delta}(y e^{\omega_l s}) - \frac{\pi}{2},$$

which proves the upper part of the bound (48a).

The subsolution requires a subtler approach: on one hand we need something we can compare to $U_{\alpha\delta}$, on the other hand we already showed that taking $U_\alpha(\xi)$ alone can only lead to a supersolution. Surprisingly, a small perturbation of $U_{\alpha\delta}$ can serve as a subsolution; let us define

$$\underline{\Phi}(\xi, s) := U_{\alpha\delta}(\xi) + e^{-2\omega_l s} q(\xi), \tag{53}$$

where the shape of the profile q is yet to be determined. In the following paragraphs, we show that q can be chosen in such a way that $\underline{\Phi}$ is actually a subsolution and $q(\xi) \geq 0$. Then, by definition of $\underline{\Phi}$, the following series of inequalities holds:

$$U_{\alpha\delta}(\xi) \leq U_{\alpha\delta}(\xi) + e^{-2\omega_l s} q(\xi) = \underline{\Phi}(\xi, s) \leq \Phi(\xi, s)$$

thus providing the lower bound of (47).

Regrouping the terms leads us to

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{U}(\underline{\Phi}) = &- \left(q'' + \frac{d-1}{\xi} q' - \frac{d-1}{\xi^2} \cos(2U_{\alpha\delta}) q \right) && \text{(54a)} \\
&+ \left(\frac{1}{2} + \omega_l \right) \xi U'_{\alpha\delta} && \text{(54b)} \\
&+ e^{-2\omega_l s} \left(-2\omega_l q + \left(\frac{1}{2} + \omega_l \right) \xi q' \right) && \text{(54c)} \\
&+ e^{2\omega_l s} \frac{d-1}{2\xi^2} (\sin(2U_{\alpha\delta}) - \sin(2U_{\alpha\delta} + e^{-2\omega_l s} q) + 2\cos(2U_{\alpha\delta}) e^{-2\omega_l s} q), && \text{(54d)}
\end{aligned}$$

which, despite looking complicated, has some desired qualities. Namely, the last two terms can be regarded as small for large times (the last term is a nonlinearity of second order in q), while the first two terms are of comparable order in time. This formal analysis leads to the particular choice of q that compensates for the positivity of the second term in (54); take q solving

$$\begin{aligned}
q'' + \frac{d-1}{\xi} q' - \frac{d-1}{\xi^2} \cos(2U_{\alpha\delta}) q = \left(\beta + \frac{1}{2} + \omega_l \right) \xi U'_{\alpha\delta}, \\
q(0) = 0, \qquad q'(0) = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

The whole expression simplifies (54) significantly to

$$\mathcal{U}(\underline{\Phi}) = -\beta \xi U'_{\alpha\delta}(\xi) + \mathcal{O}(e^{-2\omega_l s} \widetilde{q}(\xi)) \tag{56}$$

for some $\widetilde{q}$ and any $\beta > 0$. This, in turn, leads to $\mathcal{U}(\underline{\Phi}) \leq 0$ (here we anticipate that the remainder term $e^{-2\omega_l s}\widetilde{q}(\xi)$ is small for our choice of q, we prove this below). We would like to point out, that when $\beta = 0$ the $\underline{\Phi}$ is just a second order approximation to a solution of $\mathcal{U}(\Phi) = 0$ (the first order approximation being $U_{\alpha\delta}$).

For large ξ, any solution to (55) behaves like $q(\xi) \sim \xi^{2-\gamma}$, which means that, depending on the sign of $2 - \gamma$, q is either bounded or increases. The first case leads to smallness (the whole perturbation decays exponentially in time), in the second case q increases with ξ and thus is maximal at the boundary of the inner region $\xi = K$. At the boundary we have

$$|e^{-2\omega_l s} q(\xi)| \leq |e^{-2\omega_l s} q(K)| \sim (K e^{-\omega_l s})^2 K^{-\gamma}$$

and the right hand side is small when s_0 is taken large. The arbitrary smallness of the perturbation is necessary for the following comparison between initial data to hold

$$\underline{\Phi}(\xi, s_0) = U_{\alpha\delta}(\xi) + e^{-2\omega_l s} q(\xi) \leq U_\alpha(\xi) = \Phi(\xi, s_0). \tag{57}$$

Moreover, at the boundary $\xi = K$ we have

$$\underline{\Phi}(K, s) = -h(\alpha\delta K)^{-\gamma}(1 + \mathcal{O}((e^{-\omega_l s} K)^2))$$

which, together with (50) yields

$$\underline{\Phi}(K, s) \leq \Phi(K, s) \tag{58}$$

if we pick

$$\eta < \alpha_l \left(\delta^{-\gamma} - 1\right) \tag{59}$$

and s_0 accordingly large. As for the remainder terms, the term (54c) must obey the same type of bounds as q, while the last term (54d) is a nonlinear term of second order in $e^{-2\omega_l s} q$ thus, up to first order, it is well approximated by

$$(54\text{d}) \sim e^{-2\omega_l s} \widetilde{q}(\xi)$$

where $\widetilde{q}(\xi) = \xi^3$ near $\xi = 0$ and $\widetilde{q}(\xi) = \xi^{4-3\gamma}$ when ξ is large. Exploiting the fact that $\gamma > 1$ we get $\xi^{4-3\gamma} = \xi^{2-\gamma} \leq \xi^{2-\gamma} K^{-2(\gamma-1)} \ll \xi^{2-\gamma}$, thus the nonlinear term is certainly of smaller order of magnitude than q. Combining (56), (57) and (58) we conclude that $\underline{\Phi}$ is a subsolution, whence the comparison principle yields

$$U_{\alpha\delta}(\xi) + e^{-2\omega_l s} q(\xi) \leq \Phi(\xi, s)$$

but we are still missing the positivity of q to get $U_{\alpha\delta}(\xi) \leq \Phi(\xi, s)$ and finalize the proof.

The positivity is easily seen if we rewrite (55) as

$$\frac{d}{d\xi}\left(\frac{q(\xi)}{\xi U'_{\alpha\delta}(\xi)}\right) = \frac{1}{\xi^{d+1}} \int_0^\xi s^{d+1} U'_{\alpha\delta}(s)^2 f(s)\, ds \tag{60}$$

where

$$f(\xi) = \left(\beta + \frac{1}{2} + \omega_l\right) \xi U'_{\alpha\delta}(\xi) \geq 0. \tag{61}$$

In the expression (60) we got rid of the nonlinear term by turning to equation for $U_{\alpha\delta}$. The idea for such treatment comes from the factorization of the operatorial form of the left hand side of (55) and from the equation for $U_{\alpha\delta}$. Nonnegativity of the source term (61) gives $(q(\xi)/\xi U_{\alpha\delta}(\xi))' \geq 0$ or

$$q(\xi) \geq \xi U'_{\alpha\delta}(\xi) \cdot \lim_{s\to 0+} \frac{q(s)}{sU'_{\alpha\delta}(s)} = 0,$$

by the virtue of boundary conditions $q(0) = 0$ and $q'(0) = 0$.

Combining (52) and (59) it is sufficient to pick η such that

$$0 < \eta < \alpha_l \min(\delta^{-\gamma} - 1, 1 - \delta^{\gamma}) = \alpha_l(\delta^{-\gamma} - 1).$$

The proof is now complete. □

V. ESTIMATES FOR SPECTRAL COEFFICIENTS

The goal of this and the remaining sections is to produce the missing a priori estimates that we were eager enough to use in Lemma IV.3 above. That is, we aim to show that given a solution ψ_q, such that

$$|\psi_q(s)(y) + e^{-\lambda_l s}\phi_l| < \eta e^{-\lambda_l s}(y^{-\gamma} + y^{2\lambda_l}) \qquad \text{for } Ke^{-\omega_l s} \leq y \leq e^{\sigma s} \tag{62}$$

(or $\psi_q \in \mathcal{W}^1_{s_0,s_1}$ equivalently), with q being the root of P_{s_0,s_1}, we can improve the bound (62) to

$$|\psi_q(s)(y) + e^{-\lambda_l s}\phi_l| < \nu e^{-\lambda_l s}(y^{-\gamma} + y^{2\lambda_l}) \qquad \text{for } Ke^{-\omega_l s} \leq y \leq e^{\sigma s} \tag{63}$$

for *arbitrary* $\nu \in (0, 1)$ provided we pick $s_0 = s_0(\nu)$ large enough.

The first information that we can hope to extract is how does the condition

$$P_{s_0,s_1}(q) = (\langle \psi_q(s_1), \phi_0\rangle, \ldots, \langle \psi_q(s_1), \phi_{l-1}\rangle) = 0$$

influences the values of q. For that, we need the Duhamel's formula that we derived in Corollary III.5, from which we get, for $n = 0, 1, ..., \ell - 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \langle \psi_q(s_1), \phi_n\rangle &= e^{-\lambda_n(s_1-s_0)}\langle \psi_{0,q}, \phi_n\rangle + \int_{s_0}^{s_1} e^{-\lambda_n(s_1-s)}\langle F(\psi(s)), \phi_n\rangle\, ds \\ &= e^{-\lambda_n(s_1-s_0)}\left(q_n + e^{-\lambda_l s_0}\langle \widetilde{\phi}_l, \phi_n\rangle\right) + \int_{s_0}^{s_1} e^{-\lambda_n(s_1-s)}\langle F(\psi(s)), \phi_n\rangle\, ds \end{aligned}$$

or equivalently

$$q_n = e^{-\lambda_l s_0}\langle \widetilde{\phi}_l, \phi_n\rangle - \int_{s_0}^{s_1} e^{-\lambda_n(s_0-s)}\langle F(\psi(s)), \phi_n\rangle\, ds \tag{64}$$

with

$$\widetilde{\phi}_l := \sum_{n=0}^{l-1} e^{\lambda_l s_0} q_n \phi_n - e^{\lambda_l s_0} \psi_{0,q}.$$

Remark V.1. *We have defined $\widetilde{\phi}_l$ so that $\widetilde{\phi}_l = \phi_l$ in the region $y \in [\widetilde{K} e^{\omega_l s_0}, e^{\widetilde{\sigma} s_0})$.*

Using the properties of ψ_q we can now estimate the scalar products $\langle \widetilde{\phi}_l, \phi_n \rangle$ and $\langle F(\psi(s)), \phi_n \rangle$ leading to Lemma V.4. As a first step towards proving Lemma V.4 we estimate the linear and nonlinear terms in (64) as follows.

Lemma V.2. *The term $\widetilde{\phi}_l$ from the definition of initial data can be bounded by*

$$\|\widetilde{\phi}_l - \phi_l\| \lesssim e^{-\kappa s_0}$$

with some $\kappa > 0$. Moreover, there holds

$$|\langle \widetilde{\phi}_l, \phi_n \rangle| \lesssim e^{-\kappa s_0}$$

for $n \neq l$.

Proof. The notion of $\widetilde{\phi}_l$ is convenient since we have $\widetilde{\phi}_l = \phi_l$ in $y \in [\widetilde{K} e^{-\omega_l s_0}, e^{\widetilde{\sigma} s_0})$, so $\widetilde{\phi}_l$ comes very close to the pure mode ϕ_l. We start with

$$|\phi_l(y) - \tilde{\phi}_l(y)| \lesssim \begin{cases} y^{-\gamma} & \text{for } y \in (0, \widetilde{K} e^{-\omega_l s_0}) \\ 0 & \text{for } y \in [\widetilde{K} e^{-\omega_l s_0}, e^{\widetilde{\sigma} s_0}) \\ y^{2\lambda_l} & \text{for } y \in [e^{\widetilde{\sigma} s_0}, \infty), \end{cases}$$

which follows from the definition of $\widetilde{\phi}_l$ and the asymptotics of eigenfunctions. The norm can now be easily estimated as

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widetilde{\phi}_l - \phi_l\|^2 &\lesssim \int_0^{\widetilde{K} e^{-\omega_l s_0}} y^{d-2\gamma-1}\, dy + \int_{e^{\widetilde{\sigma} s_0}}^{\infty} y^{4\lambda_l + d - 1} e^{-\frac{y^2}{4}}\, dy \\ &\lesssim (K e^{-\omega_l s_0})^{2+\omega} = e^{-(2+\omega)(1-\widetilde{k})\omega_l s_0} \end{aligned}$$

(the second integral is proportional to a double exponent in s_0 and thus subdominant). By definition $0 < \widetilde{k} < k < 1$, which suffices to prove the first statement of the lemma. The second statement follows from the first via Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and orthogonality of ϕ_l and ϕ_n for $n \neq l$ $\langle \widetilde{\phi}_l, \phi_n \rangle = \langle \widetilde{\phi}_l - \phi_l, \phi_n \rangle \leq \|\widetilde{\phi}_l - \phi_l\|,\ n \neq l.$ ∎

In a similar spirit we prove an estimate for the nonlinear term.

Lemma V.3. *For $\psi_q \in \mathcal{W}^1_{s_0,s_1}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and any $s_0 \le s \le s_1$ we have*

$$|\langle F(\psi(s)), \phi_n\rangle| \lesssim (n+1)e^{-\lambda_l s}e^{-\kappa\omega_l s}$$

with $\kappa = \min(2\gamma, \omega/2) > 0$ and eigenvector ϕ_n.

Proof. The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields

$$|\langle F(\psi_q(s)), \phi_n\rangle| \le \left(\int_0^\infty (yF(\psi(s)))^2 y^{d-1}e^{-\frac{y^2}{4}}\,dy\right)^{1/2} \left\|\frac{\phi_n}{(\cdot)}\right\|.$$

Going back to the Hardy inequality in Lemma III.3, in particular, to the bound (27) and pick $\alpha = (d-2)/2$, we get

$$\lambda_n\|\phi_n\|^2 = \langle A\phi_n, \phi_n\rangle \ge \frac{\omega}{4}\left\|\frac{\phi_n}{(\cdot)}\right\|^2 - \frac{d-2}{4}\|\phi_n\|^2 \tag{65}$$

(the inequality was derived for $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$ but it is easy to check that it also holds for the eigenvectors). Solving (65) for $\|\phi_n/(\cdot)\|$ and plugging in the explicit formulae $\lambda_n = -\frac{\gamma}{2} + n$ and $\gamma = \frac{d-2}{2} - \frac{\omega}{2}$ we get

$$\left\|\frac{\phi_n}{(\cdot)}\right\| \le \left(\frac{4n}{\omega} + 1\right)$$

for ϕ_n normalized to 1.

As for the second term, by Lemma IV.2 and some direct computations we have

$$|F(\psi(s))(y)| \lesssim \frac{1}{y^2}\begin{cases} Q(e^{\omega_l s}y) & 0 \le y < Ke^{-\omega_l s} \\ e^{-3\lambda_l}(y^{-3\gamma} + y^{6\lambda_l}) & Ke^{-\omega_l s} \le y < e^{\sigma s} \\ 1 & e^{\sigma s} < y \end{cases} \tag{66}$$

where Q is a positive function

$$Q(\xi) = 2U_{\alpha/\delta}(\xi) - 2\sin(2U_{\alpha/\delta}(\xi)) = c\xi^{-6\gamma} + \mathcal{O}(\xi^{-6\gamma-2}). \tag{67}$$

Employing the bounds (66) we are led to

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^\infty (yF(\psi(s)))^2 y^{d-1}e^{-\frac{y^2}{4}}\,dy &\lesssim \int_0^{Ke^{-\omega_l s}} Q(e^{\omega_l s}y)^2 y^{d-3}e^{-\frac{y^2}{4}}\,dy \\ &+e^{-6\lambda_l s}\int_{Ke^{-\omega_l s}}^1 y^{d-3-6\gamma}e^{-\frac{y^2}{4}}\,dy + e^{-6\lambda_l s}\int_1^{e^{\sigma s}} y^{d-3+6\lambda_l}e^{-\frac{y^2}{4}}\,dy \\ &+\int_{e^{\sigma s}}^\infty y^{d-3}e^{-\frac{y^2}{4}}\,dy = I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4.\end{aligned}$$

where we took the liberty to split the region $Ke^{-\omega_l} \le y < e^{\sigma s}$ into two and take only the respective dominant parts of $(y^{-3\gamma} + y^{3\lambda_l})$ into account. In view of the rapid decay of the weight the last

integral tends to zero with $s \to \infty$ faster than any exponential function; also thanks to the weight the integral in I_3 converges as $s \to \infty$ hence

$$I_3 \lesssim e^{-2\lambda_l s} e^{-4\gamma\omega_l s}. \tag{68}$$

The weight in the remaining I_1 and I_2 can be disregarded thanks to $y \leq 1$; in particular for I_1 this leads to

$$I_1 \leq (e^{-\omega_l s})^{d-2} \int_0^K Q(\xi)^2 \xi^{d-3}\, d\xi.$$

Interestingly, this integral can either converge or diverge with $K \to \infty$ (cf. the asymptotics of Q) hence we the following two cases

$$I_1 \lesssim (e^{-\omega_l s})^{d-2} \begin{cases} K^{\omega-4\gamma} & \omega > 4\gamma \\ 1 & \omega < 4\gamma \end{cases}$$

(we left out the case $\omega = 4\gamma$, when the integral diverges logarithmically, because it corresponds to a noninteger dimension). An analogous phenomenon, although in reverse, occurs for I_2

$$I_2 \lesssim e^{-6\lambda_l s} \begin{cases} 1 & \omega > 4\gamma \\ (Ke^{-\omega_l s})^{\omega-4\gamma} & \omega < 4\gamma. \end{cases}$$

Combining I_1 and I_2, with $2\gamma = d - 2 - \omega$ and rearranging terms we discover that

$$I_1 + I_2 \lesssim e^{-2\lambda_l s} \begin{cases} e^{-4\gamma\omega_l s}(1 + (Ke^{-\omega_l s})^{\omega-4\gamma}) & \omega > 4\gamma \\ e^{-\omega\omega_l s}(1 + K^{\omega-4\gamma}) & \omega < 4\gamma. \end{cases}$$

In view of $1 \ll K$ and $Ke^{-\omega_l s} \ll 1$ the terms containing K can be safely ignored as higher order corrections. We can now compare the estimates for I_1, I_2 and I_3 to conclude that

$$\left(\int_0^\infty (yF(\psi(s)))^2 y^{d-1} e^{-\frac{y^2}{4}}\, dy \right)^{1/2} \lesssim e^{-\lambda_l s} e^{-\min(2\gamma, \omega/2)\omega_l s}.$$

The proof is now complete. □

Lemma V.4. *If $P_{s_0,s_1}(q) = 0$ then there exists $\kappa > 0$ such that*

$$|q_n| \lesssim e^{-\lambda_l s_0} e^{-\kappa s_0}, \qquad n = 0, \ldots, l-1.$$

Proof. Applying the results from Lemmas V.2 and V.3 to the formula (64) for q_n we get

$$\begin{aligned} |q_n| &\leq e^{-\lambda_l s_0} |\langle \widetilde{\phi}_l, \phi_n \rangle| + \int_{s_0}^{s_1} e^{-\lambda_n (s_0 - s)} |\langle F(\psi_q(s)), \phi_n \rangle|\, ds \\ &\lesssim e^{-\lambda_l s_0} \left(e^{-\kappa s_0} + (1+n) \int_{s_0}^{s_1} e^{(\lambda_n - \lambda_l)s} e^{-\kappa s}\, ds \right) \end{aligned}$$

(for simplicity we took κ to be the smaller one from the two Lemmas). We know that $n \leq l-1$ so we can drop the $(1+n)$ coefficient and $\lambda_n - \lambda_l \leq 1$ so the integration of what remains from the nonlinear term gives us

$$|q_n| \lesssim e^{-\lambda_l s_0}\left(e^{-\kappa s_0} + e^{-s_0}e^{-\kappa s_0}\right) \lesssim e^{-\lambda_l s_0}e^{-\kappa s_0},$$

which proves the desired estimate. □

VI. A PRIORI SHORT TIME ESTIMATES

From here on, we implicitly assume that q is a root of $P_{s_0,s_1}(q) = 0$. In the previous section we established that for any root of $P_{s_0,s_1}(q) = 0$ there holds $|q_n| \lesssim e^{-\lambda s_0}e^{-\kappa s_0}$ for some $\kappa > 0$. Here we show that for any $\nu \in (0,1)$ and $s_0 = s_0(\nu)$ large enough we can produce an improved bound of type

$$|\psi_q(s)(y) + e^{-s\lambda_l}\phi_l| \leq \nu e^{-\lambda_l s}(y^{-\gamma} + y^{2\lambda_l}), \qquad y \in [Ke^{\omega_l s}, e^{\sigma s}), \qquad s - s_0 \leq 1.$$

To get started we use a variation of constants formula to write down the left hand side of (46) as

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_q(s) + e^{-s\lambda_l}\phi_l &= e^{-A(s-s_0)}\left(\psi_{0,q}(y) + e^{-s_0\lambda_l}\phi_l\right) + \int_{s_0}^{s} e^{-A(s-\tau)}F(\psi(\tau))d\tau \\ &= e^{-A(s-s_0)}\widetilde{\phi}_l + \int_{s_0}^{s} e^{-A(s-\tau)}F(\psi(\tau))d\tau.\end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

Evaluated at a single point y this yields

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\psi(y,s) + e^{-s\lambda_l}\phi_l(y)\right| &\leq \left|(e^{-A(s-s_0)}\widetilde{\phi}_l)(y)\right| + \int_{s_0}^{s}\left|\left(e^{-A(s-\tau)}F(\psi(\tau))\right)(y)\right|d\tau \\ &= S_1 + S_2.\end{aligned}$$

The next step consists of showing pointwise bounds on the action of the semigroup $e^{-(s-s_0)A}$ on elements of $\mathcal{H}$. Via a simple change of variables we recover the explicit heat kernel associated to $e^{-(s-s_0)A}$ and use the results of Muckenhoupt [14] to estimate the group action by a simple maximal function.

Remark VI.1. *The estimate via the maximal function in Lemma VI.2 below represents a trade off. On one hand it gives a robust pointwise bound on $e^{-(s-s_0)A}\psi$. On the other hand, the estimate* (70) *contains a factor $(e^{-\frac{1}{2}(s-s_0)})^{-\gamma} = e^{-\lambda_0(s-s_0)}$ growing exponentially in time (this growth rate, given by the smallest eigenvalue of A, is precisely what one would expect from a generic function ψ). For $s - s_0 \leq 1$ the exponential growth boils down to a constant factor but this estimate is useless for long times (with a curious exception of Lemma VI.5 and Lemma VI.8).*

Lemma VI.2. *The action of the semigroup $e^{-(s-s_0)A}$ on a function $\psi(y) \in \mathcal{H}$ can be bounded as*

$$|e^{-(s-s_0)A}\psi(y)| \lesssim (ye^{-\frac{1}{2}(s-s_0)})^{-\gamma}(M\psi)(y), \tag{70}$$

where $M\psi$ is the maximal function defined as

$$M\psi(y) = \sup_{I \ni y} \frac{\int_I (|\psi(x)|x^\gamma) x^{1+\omega} e^{-\frac{x^2}{4}} dx}{\int_I x^{1+\omega} e^{-\frac{x^2}{4}} dx.} \tag{71}$$

with supremum taken over all subintervals I of $\mathbb{R}_+$ that contain y.

Moreover, if function $|\psi(x)|x^\gamma$ is non increasing (respectively, non decreasing), then the supremum in (71) is attained by the interval $I = [0, y]$ (respectively, $[y, \infty)$).

Proof. We first decompose $\psi(y)$ into eigenvectors of A

$$\psi(y) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \phi_n(y) a_n, \quad a_n = \int_0^\infty \phi_n(x)\psi(x) x^{d-1} e^{-\frac{x^2}{4}}\, dx$$

and then act on it with $e^{-(s-s_0)A}$ to get

$$e^{-(s-s_0)A}\psi(y) = \int_0^\infty \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \phi_n(x)\phi_n(y) e^{-(s-s_0)\lambda_n} \right) \psi(x) x^{d-1} e^{-\frac{x^2}{4}}\, dx. \tag{72}$$

By definition, ϕ_n can be written in terms of Laguerre polynomials, so we can rewrite the sum in parentheses as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \phi_n(x)\phi_n(y) e^{-(s-s_0)\lambda_n} &= 2^{\omega+2}(xy)^{-\gamma} e^{(s-s_0)\frac{\gamma}{2}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n^2 L_n^{(\omega/2)}\left(\frac{y^2}{4}\right) L_n^{(\omega/2)}\left(\frac{x^2}{4}\right) e^{-(s-s_0)n} \\ &= 2^{-(\omega+1)}(xy)^{-\gamma} e^{(s-s_0)\frac{\gamma}{2}} P_{\omega/2}\left(\frac{x^2}{4}, \frac{y^2}{4}, e^{-(s-s_0)}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

Plugging this into (72) we get

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-(s-s_0)A}\psi(y) &= 2^{-(\omega+1)} y^{-\gamma} e^{(s-s_0)\frac{\gamma}{2}} \int_0^\infty P_{\omega/2}\left(\frac{x^2}{4}, \frac{y^2}{4}, e^{-(s-s_0)}\right) \left(\psi(x)x^{-\gamma}\right) x^{d-1} e^{-\frac{x^2}{4}}\, dx \\ &= 2^{-(\omega+1)} y^{-\gamma} e^{(s-s_0)\frac{\gamma}{2}} \int_0^\infty P_{\omega/2}\left(\frac{x^2}{4}, \frac{y^2}{4}, e^{-(s-s_0)}\right) \left(\psi(x)x^{\gamma}\right) x^{\omega+1} e^{-\frac{x^2}{4}}\, dx. \end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

The positive function $P_{\omega/2}$, which replaced the sum in (73), is known as Poisson Kernel for Laguerre polynomials. Muckenhoupt [14] proved that for any function $f(x) \geq 0$ such that $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+, x^\alpha e^{-x}\, dx)$, the integral

$$g(Y, z) = \int_0^\infty P_\alpha(Y, X, z) f(X) X^\alpha e^{-X}\, dX, \quad 0 < z < 1$$

can be bounded by a maximal function

$$g(Y, z) \lesssim \mathcal{M}f(Y), \quad \mathcal{M}f(Y) = \sup_{I \ni Y} \frac{\int_I f(X) X^\alpha e^{-X}\, dX}{\int_I X^\alpha e^{-X}\, dX}. \tag{75}$$

Applying (75) with $\alpha = \omega/2$ to (74) and changing variables as

$$Y = \frac{y^2}{4}, \quad X = \frac{x^2}{4}, \quad z = e^{-(s-s_0)}, \quad f(Y) = y^\gamma \psi(y),$$

we get

$$|e^{-(s-s_0)A}\psi(y)| \lesssim e^{(s-s_0)\frac{\gamma}{2}} y^{-\gamma} \cdot M\psi(y). \tag{76}$$

The new maximal operator M is given by (71). In terms of the function ψ, the condition $f \in L^1\left(\mathbb{R}_+, x^\alpha e^{-x}\, dx\right)$, is equivalent to simply $|\langle \phi_0, \psi\rangle| < \infty$, which is true for any $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$.

The last statement of this lemma may be shown by writing the interval as $I = [a, b]$ and differentiating with respect to a or b. □

Lemma VI.3. *For any $\nu \in (0,1)$ there exists s_0 such that*

$$|e^{-A(s-s_0)}(\psi_{0,l} + e^{-\lambda_l s_0}\phi_l)| \le \nu e^{-\lambda_l s}(y^{-\gamma} + y^{2\lambda_l}), \qquad y \in [Ke^{-\omega_l s}, e^{\sigma s}) \tag{77}$$

for $s - s_0 \le 1$.

Proof. We start by noticing that

$$\psi_{0,l} + e^{-\lambda_l s_0}\phi_l = \sum_{n=0}^{l-1} q_n \phi_n(y) + e^{-\lambda_l s_0}(\phi_l(y) - \widetilde{\phi}_l(y)). \tag{78}$$

We now use $s - s_0 \le 1$ and $|\phi_n(y)| \le \alpha_n y^{-\gamma} + \beta_n y^{2\lambda_n} \lesssim y^{-\gamma} + y^{2\lambda_l}$ for $n \le l$ to bound the action of $e^{-(s_0-s)A}$ on the first term in (78):

$$\begin{aligned} \left| e^{-(s-s_0)A} \sum_{n=0}^{l-1} q_n \phi_n(y) \right| &\le \left| \sum_{n=0}^{l-1} e^{-(s-s_0)\lambda_n} q_n \phi_n(y) \right| \\ &\lesssim (y^{-\gamma} + y^{2\lambda_l}) \sum_{n=0}^{l-1} |q_n| \lesssim e^{-\lambda_l s_0} e^{-\kappa s_0}(y^{-\gamma} + y^{2\lambda_l}). \end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

In the last estimate (coming from Lemma V.4) κ is a positive constant. As long as s and s_0 are comparable the estimate (79) is of the type (77).

The rest of this proof is devoted to estimating the semigroup action on the second part of (78), $\phi_l(y) - \widetilde{\phi}_l(y)$. Let us remind that

$$|\phi_l(y) - \widetilde{\phi}_l(y)| \lesssim \begin{cases} y^{-\gamma} & \text{for } y \in (0, \widetilde{K}e^{-\omega_l s_0}), \\ 0 & \text{for } y \in [\widetilde{K}e^{-\omega_l s_0}, e^{\widetilde{\sigma} s_0}), \\ y^{2\lambda_l} & \text{for } y \in [e^{\widetilde{\sigma} s_0}, \infty), \end{cases} \tag{80}$$

which we rewrite as

$$|\phi_l(y) - \widetilde{\phi}_l(y)| \lesssim \mathbf{1}_{(0,\widetilde{K}e^{-\omega_l s_0})}(y) \cdot y^{-\gamma} + \mathbf{1}_{[e^{\widetilde{\sigma}s_0},\infty)}(y) \cdot y^{2\lambda_l} = w_1(y) + w_2(y), \tag{81}$$

using an indicator function

$$\mathbf{1}_S(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } x \in S, \\ 0 & \text{for } x \notin S. \end{cases}$$

Because the heat kernel associated to e^{-sA} is positive we have

$$|e^{-(s-s_0)A}(\phi_l - \widetilde{\phi}_l)(y)| \lesssim (e^{-(s-s_0)A}w_1)(y) + (e^{-(s-s_0)A}w_2)(y). \tag{82}$$

Finally, we employ Lemma VI.2 to bound the both terms by the maximal functions:

$$|e^{-(s-s_0)A}(\phi_l - \widetilde{\phi}_l)(y)| \lesssim y^{-\gamma} e^{\frac{\gamma}{2}(s-s_0)}((Mw_1)(y) + (Mw_2)(y)) \tag{83}$$

with M defined in (71).

We proceed with the proof by exploiting the monotonicity of $r^\gamma w_1(r)$ and $r^\gamma w_2(r)$ to find an interval $I \ni y$, for which the supremum is attained. Because $r^\gamma w_1(r) = \mathbf{1}_{(0,\widetilde{K}e^{-\omega_l s_0})}(r)$ is non increasing, the interval $I \ni y$, for each $y > \widetilde{K}e^{-\omega_l s_0}$, is simply $I = [0, y]$ and the maximal function evaluates to

$$(Mw_1)(y) = \frac{\int_0^{\widetilde{K}e^{-\omega_l s_0}} r^{1+\omega} e^{-\frac{r^2}{4}} dr}{\int_0^y r^{1+\omega} e^{-\frac{r^2}{4}} dr} \lesssim \frac{(\widetilde{K}e^{-\omega_l s_0})^{2+\omega}}{\int_0^y r^{1+\omega} e^{-\frac{r^2}{4}} dr}. \tag{84}$$

Remark VI.4. *At this point it is important to remind that from the definitions of K and $\widetilde{K}$ we have $\widetilde{K}e^{-\omega_l s_0} \ll Ke^{-\omega_l s}$ as long as $s - s_0 \leq 1$ and s_0 is sufficiently large; by assumption we are dealing with $Ke^{-\omega_l s} \leq y$, so we always have $\widetilde{K}e^{-\omega_l s_0} \ll y$. By a similar argument we have $e^{\widetilde{\sigma}s_0} \ll e^{\sigma s}$.*

The denominator is minimized for the smallest admissible y, which by the assumption of this Lemma is $y = Ke^{-\omega_l s}$, hence

$$(Mw_1)(y) \lesssim \left(\frac{\widetilde{K}e^{-\omega_l s_0}}{Ke^{-\omega_l s}}\right)^{2+\omega} = \left(e^{\omega_l(s-s_0)}e^{-s_0(k-\widetilde{k})}\right)^{2+\omega}. \tag{85}$$

For short times, $s \leq s_0 + 1$, the first exponent is bounded, while the second exponent can be made arbitrarily small by making s_0 large thanks to $0 < \widetilde{k} < k$.

We continue with the second maximal function, for which $r^\gamma w_2(r) = \mathbf{1}_{[e^{\widetilde{\sigma}s_0},\infty)}(r) r^{2l}$ is non decreasing so, this time, the supremum of the maximal function is attained for $I = [y, \infty)$, yielding

$$(Mw_2)(y) = \frac{\int_{e^{\widetilde{\sigma}s_0}}^\infty r^{1+\omega+2l} e^{-\frac{r^2}{4}} dr}{\int_y^\infty r^{1+\omega} e^{-\frac{r^2}{4}} dr}. \tag{86}$$

This time, the denominator is small for $y \gg 1$, leading to

$$(Mw_2)(y) \lesssim y^{2l}\left(\eta^{2l+\omega+1}e^{-\frac{y^2}{4}(\eta^2-1)}(1+\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-2}))\right) \tag{87}$$

with $\eta = e^{\widetilde{\sigma}s_0}/y \geq e^{-\sigma(s-s_0)}e^{-s_0(\widetilde{\sigma}-\sigma)}$. As in the case of the first maximal function, by keeping $s-s_0$ bounded and by increasing s_0, we can make η arbitrarily large, in turn making the quantity in parentheses arbitrarily small. Combining (86) and (84) leads to $Mw_1(y)+Mw_2(y) \leq \nu(1+y^{2l})$ with ν being arbitrarily small provided $s_0 = s_0(\nu)$ is large enough.

Combining (83), (85) and (87) we arrive at the sought for estimate

$$|e^{-(s-s_0)A}(\phi_l - \widetilde{\phi}_l)(y)| \lesssim \nu e^{\frac{\gamma}{2}(s-s_0)}e^{-\lambda_l s_0}y^{-\gamma}(1+y^{2l}) \lesssim \nu e^{-\lambda_l s}y^{-\gamma}(1+y^{2l}) \tag{88}$$

under the assumption $s-s_0 \leq 1$. □

Interestingly, by slightly restricting the choice of constants σ and $\widetilde{\sigma}$, the results of Lemma VI.3 can be extended to long-times and large y in the sense of the following Lemma.

Lemma VI.5. *For any $\nu \in (0,1)$ there exists s_0 such that*

$$|e^{-A(s-s_0)}(\psi_{0,l} + e^{-\lambda_l s_0}\phi_l)| \leq \nu e^{-\lambda_l s}(y^{-\gamma} + y^{2\lambda_l}), \qquad y \in [e^{(s-s_0)/2}, e^{\sigma s}),\ s \geq s_0+1 \tag{89}$$

under the restriction

$$\sigma < \frac{1}{4} \tag{90a}$$

$$\frac{\sigma}{1-2\sigma} < \widetilde{\sigma} < \frac{1}{2}. \tag{90b}$$

Proof. For the selected range of y we have $y \geq 1$ so we can disregard the term $y^{-\gamma}$ from the right hand side of (89) and simply show that the left hand side is bounded by $\nu e^{-\lambda_l s}y^{2\lambda_l}$. For the most part of this proof we shall follow the steps in Lemma VI.3 but with the assumption $1 \leq ye^{-(s-s_0)/2}$ instead of $s-s_0 \leq 1$.

For example, by noticing that for $\lambda_n \leq \lambda_l$

$$e^{-(s-s_0)\lambda_n}y^{2\lambda_n} = e^{-s\lambda_l}y^{2\lambda_l}e^{s_0\lambda_l}\left(ye^{-(s-s_0)/2}\right)^{-2(\lambda_l-\lambda_n)} \leq e^{-s\lambda_l}y^{2\lambda_l}e^{s_0\lambda_l},$$

as long as $y \in [e^{(s-s_0)/2}, e^{\sigma s})$, we can modify (79) in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned}\left|e^{-(s-s_0)A}\sum_{n=0}^{l-1}q_n\phi_n(y)\right| &= \left|\sum_{n=0}^{l-1}e^{-(s-s_0)\lambda_n}q_n\phi_n(y)\right| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{n=0}^{l-1}|q_n|e^{-(s-s_0)\lambda_n}y^{2\lambda_n} \\ &\lesssim e^{-s\lambda_l}y^{2\lambda_l}\left(e^{s_0\lambda_l}\sum_{n=0}^{l-1}|q_n|\right).\end{aligned}$$

Thanks to $|q_n| \lesssim e^{-\lambda_l s_0} e^{-\kappa s_0}$ from Lemma V.4, the last term in parentheses can be made arbitrarily small by increasing s_0. We can use the already established maximal functions to produce similar bounds of the remaining terms. Reusing the bound (84) in the regime $y \in [e^{(s-s_0)/2}, e^{\sigma s})$ we get the following estimate for the first maximal function

$$(Mw_1)(y) \lesssim \frac{(\widetilde{K} e^{-\omega_l s_0})^{2+\omega}}{\int_0^\infty r^{1+\omega} e^{-\frac{r^2}{4}}},$$

which again can be made small by the means of making s_0 large.

The remaining estimate for the second maximal function requires us to restrict σ and $\widetilde{\sigma}$. We have, via (87),

$$(Mw_2)(y) \lesssim y^{2l} \left((e^{\widetilde{\sigma} s_0}/y)^{2l+\omega+1} e^{-\frac{1}{4}(e^{2\widetilde{\sigma} s_0} - y^2)} (1 + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-2})) \right),$$

so the smallness of the term in parentheses can only follow if

$$y \leq e^{\sigma s} \ll e^{\widetilde{\sigma} s_0}. \tag{91}$$

The region $[e^{(s-s_0)/2}, e^{\sigma s})$ is nonempty only if $s - s_0 \leq 2\sigma s$, whence, in this Lemma, s is bounded by

$$s \leq \frac{s_0}{1 - 2\sigma}. \tag{92}$$

This restriction, together with (90b), leads us to

$$\sigma s \leq \frac{\sigma}{1 - 2\sigma} s_0 < \widetilde{\sigma} s_0$$

The assumption (90a) is necessary for there to exist a $\widetilde{\sigma}$ fulfilling (90b). Consequently, (91) holds and the proof is complete. □

Now we turn our attention to the nonlinear term

$$\int_{s_0}^{s} e^{-(s-\tau)A} F(\psi(\tau)) d\tau. \tag{93}$$

As in the previous Lemmas, we first find a suitable pointwise bound for $|F(\psi(s))(y)|$ and then use the maximal functions to estimate $|\left(e^{-(s-\tau)A} F(\psi(\tau))\right)(y)|$. Our first step is to establish a bound similar to (80) but for $F(\psi(s))$.

Lemma VI.6. *For $s \geq s_0$, $\lambda_l > 0$ and $1 \ll \Gamma \leq K$ we have*

$$|F(\psi(s))(y)| \lesssim e^{-\lambda_l s} y^{-\gamma} \begin{cases} y^{-2}\Gamma^{\gamma} & \text{for } y < \Gamma e^{-\omega_l s} \\ y^{-2}\Gamma^{-2\gamma} + y^{2l} e^{-(1-2\sigma)\lambda_l s} & \text{for } y \geq \Gamma e^{-\omega_l s} \end{cases} \tag{94}$$

Proof. From the exact form of the nonlinear term we have

$$F(\psi(s))(y) = \frac{d-1}{2y^2}|\sin(2\psi(s)(y)) - (2\psi(s)(y))| \lesssim y^{-2}|\psi(s)(y)|^3. \tag{95}$$

The first part of (94) follows immediately from (44a), that is,

$$|\psi(s)(y)| \leq \left|U_{\alpha/\delta}(ye^{\omega_l s}) - \frac{\pi}{2}\right|$$

as long as $y \leq \Gamma e^{-\omega_l s} \leq Ke^{-\omega_l s}$, and from $|U_{\alpha/\delta}(\xi) - \frac{\pi}{2}| \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$ for all $\xi \geq 0$, namely

$$|F(\psi(s))(y)| \lesssim y^{-2}\left|U_{\alpha/\delta}(ye^{\omega_l s}) - \frac{\pi}{2}\right|^3 \lesssim y^{-2} \lesssim y^{-\gamma-2}(\Gamma e^{-\omega_l s})^{\gamma} = y^{-\gamma-2}e^{-\lambda_l s}\Gamma^{\gamma}.$$

The rest of the proof is devoted to the second part of (94).

For the region $\Gamma e^{-\omega_l s} \leq y < Ke^{-\omega_l s}$, for which we can use (44a) again, along with (95) and the asymptotics of $U_{\alpha/\delta}$ (see Lemma IV.1) we get

$$|F(\psi(s))| \lesssim y^{-2}\left|U_{\alpha/\delta}(e^{\omega_l s}y) - \frac{\pi}{2}\right|^3 \lesssim y^{-2}(ye^{\omega_l s})^{-3\gamma}. \tag{96}$$

Reorganizing the terms and exploiting $y^{-2\gamma} \leq (\Gamma e^{-\omega_l s})^{-2\gamma} = \Gamma^{2\gamma}e^{2\lambda_\ell s}$, we are lead to

$$\begin{aligned} |F(\psi(s))| &\lesssim y^{-\gamma-2}e^{-\lambda_l s}(y^{-2\gamma}e^{-2\lambda_l s}) \\ &\leq y^{-\gamma-2}e^{-\lambda_l s}(\Gamma^{-2\gamma}) \end{aligned} \qquad \text{for } y \in [\Gamma e^{-\omega_l s}, Ke^{-\omega_l s}) \tag{97}$$

As for the intermediate region $Ke^{-\omega_l s} \leq y < e^{\sigma s}$, we recall (44b) and (95) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |F(\psi(s))| &\lesssim y^{-2}e^{-3\lambda_l s}(y^{-3\gamma} + y^{6\lambda_l}) \\ &= e^{-\lambda_l s}y^{-\gamma}(e^{-2\lambda_l s}y^{-2\gamma-2}) + e^{-\lambda_l s}y^{2\lambda_l}(e^{-2\lambda_l s}y^{4\lambda_l-2}) \\ &\leq e^{-\lambda_l s}y^{-\gamma-2}(K^{-2\gamma}) + e^{-\lambda_l s}y^{2\lambda_l}(e^{-2(1-2\sigma)\lambda_l s - 2\sigma s}) \\ &\leq e^{-\lambda_l s}y^{-\gamma-2}(\Gamma^{-2\gamma}) + e^{-\lambda_l s}y^{2\lambda_l}(e^{-(1-2\sigma)\lambda_l s - 2\sigma s}) \end{aligned}$$

In the last line we replace K with Γ by means of $\Gamma \leq K$ and we drop the '2' from the second summand so that it agrees with the following estimate for the external region. For $y \geq e^{\sigma s}$, by the virtue of (44c) and (95), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |F(\psi(s))| \lesssim y^{-2} &= e^{-\lambda_l s}y^{2\lambda_l}(y^{-2\lambda_l-2}e^{\lambda_l s}) \\ &\leq e^{-\lambda_l s}y^{2\lambda_l}(e^{-(1-2\sigma)\lambda_l s - 2\sigma s}), \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. □

Lemma VI.7. *For any $\nu \in (0,1)$ there exists s_0 such that*

$$\left|\int_{s_0}^{s} e^{-(s-\tau)A}F(\psi(\tau))ds\right| \leq \nu e^{-s\lambda_l}(y^{-\gamma} + y^{2\lambda_l}), \qquad y \in [Ke^{-\omega_l s}, e^{\sigma s}) \text{ and } s - s_0 \leq 1.$$

Proof. The proof uses a similar technique as the homogeneous case (Lemma VI.3). Namely, we estimate the nonlinear term according to Lemma VI.6 and then apply the Lemma VI.2. Let us start by rewriting the estimate from Lemma VI.6 as

$$|F(\psi(\tau))| \lesssim e^{-\lambda_l \tau} y^{-\gamma} (f_1(y) + f_2(y) + f_3(y))$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(y) &= \mathbf{1}_{[0,\Gamma e^{-\omega_l \tau})}(y)\, y^{-2} \Gamma^{\gamma}, \\ f_2(y) &= \mathbf{1}_{[\Gamma e^{-\omega_l \tau},\infty)}(y)\, y^{-2} \Gamma^{-2\gamma} \\ f_3(y) &= \mathbf{1}_{[\Gamma e^{-\omega_l \tau},\infty)}(y)\, y^{2l} e^{-(1-2\sigma)\lambda_l \tau}. \end{aligned}$$

By means of Lemma VI.2 we have

$$|e^{-(s-\tau)A} F(\psi(\tau))| \lesssim e^{(s-\tau)\frac{\gamma}{2}} y^{-\gamma} e^{-\lambda_l \tau} (Mf_1(y) + Mf_2(y) + Mf_3(y)), \tag{98}$$

so it is enough to show that each maximal function can be made much smaller than $1 + y^{2l}$ with appropriate choice of s_0. We shall expect that f_1 and f_2 have maximal functions that dominate for small y, while the maximal function for f_3 dominates the large y region.

As for $Mf_1(y)$, the function f_1 is nonincreasing, so the supremum in maximal function is attained for the interval $[0, y)$, hence

$$Mf_1(y) = \Gamma^{\gamma} \frac{\int_0^{\Gamma e^{-\omega_l \tau}} r^{\omega - 1} e^{-r^2/4} dr}{\int_0^{y} r^{\omega+1} e^{-r^2/4} dr}.$$

The numerator is integrable thanks to $\omega > 0$. The denominator is then minimized for $y = Ke^{-\omega_l \tau}$. Moreover, we can skip the exponential terms as near the origin they are of order one; these simplifications lead us to

$$Mf_1(y) \lesssim \Gamma^{\gamma} \frac{(\Gamma e^{-\omega_l \tau})^{\omega}}{(Ke^{-\omega_l \tau})^{\omega+2}} = \Gamma^{\gamma+\omega} K^{-\omega-2} e^{2\omega_l \tau} = e^{\omega_l s_0 (k\theta(\gamma+\omega) - k(\omega+2)+2)} e^{2\omega_l(\tau - s_0)}, \tag{99}$$

where, for convenience, we defined Γ as a power of K:

$$\Gamma := K^{\theta}, \qquad \theta \in (0,1)$$

and used the definition $K = e^{k\omega_l s_0}$. The last term in (99) decays exponentially with s_0 if we pick θ such that

$$\theta < \frac{k(\omega+2) - 2}{k(\gamma+\omega)}. \tag{100}$$

In a similar fashion we estimate $Mf_2(y)$, although this time, we extend the support of f_2 by dropping the indicator function (i.e. exploiting $\mathbf{1}_S \leq 1$). Because f_2 without the indicator function is nonincreasing, the explicit interval for the maximal function is $[0, y)$ and we have

$$Mf_2(y) \lesssim \Gamma^{-2\gamma} \frac{\int_0^y r^{\omega-1} e^{-r^2/4} dr}{\int_0^y r^{\omega+1} e^{-r^2/4} dr}.$$

As expected, the maximal function attains its maximum at $y = Ke^{-\omega_l s}$, so once again we can drop the exponential factors and reduce Mf_2 to two simple integrals

$$Mf_2(y) \lesssim \Gamma^{-2\gamma} \frac{(Ke^{-\omega_l s})^\omega}{(Ke^{-\omega_l s})^{\omega+2}} = e^{2\omega_l \tau_0 (1-k-k\gamma\theta)} e^{2\omega_l (s-\tau_0)}.$$

This time, for the right hand side to be decreasing to 0 with τ_0, we must have

$$\frac{(1-k)}{k\gamma} < \theta \tag{101}$$

but at the same time condition (100) must be satisfied as well, leading to the following condition for k:

$$\frac{(1-k)}{k\gamma} < \frac{k(\omega+2)-2}{k(\gamma+\omega)},$$

or equivalently

$$k_0 := \frac{3\gamma+\omega}{3\gamma+\omega+\gamma\omega} < k < 1.$$

It is easy to see that $k_0 < 1$ (that is, if $\gamma, \omega > 0$, which is always true for $d > 4 + 2\sqrt{2}$), so it is always possible to choose such k.

The last term, Mf_3, is the easiest one to control. Since f_3 is an increasing function, its maximal function reduces to

$$Mf_3(y) = e^{-(1-2\sigma)\lambda_l \tau} \frac{\int_y^\infty r^{2l+1+\omega} e^{-r^2/4} dr}{\int_y^\infty r^{1+\omega} e^{-r^2/4} dr}.$$

By standard results for gamma functions the above ratio can be bounded by

$$Mf_3(y) \lesssim e^{-(1-2\sigma)\lambda_l \tau} (1 + y^{2l}),$$

which already has a right decay with τ (or equivalently with s_0).

It now remains to integrate the formula (98) over $\tau \in [s_0, s]$, taking into account $s - s_0 \leq 1$, to arrive at the thesis of this lemma. □

We follow up with the extension of Lemma VI.7 to long times.

Lemma VI.8. *For any $\nu \in (0,1)$ there exists s_0 such that*

$$\left| \int_{s_0}^{s} e^{-(s-\tau)A} F(\psi(\tau)) ds \right| \leq \nu e^{-s\lambda_l} y^{-\gamma}, \qquad y \in [e^{(s-s_0)/2}, e^{\sigma s}),\ s \geq s_0 + 1$$

provided that

$$\sigma < \frac{1}{10l}.$$

Proof. The proof follows from the same ideas as of Lemma VI.5 by using estimates already established in Lemma VI.7. We first note that for $y \geq e^{(s-s_0)/2}$ we have $y^{-\gamma} \leq y^{2\lambda_l} e^{-l(s-s_0)}$ and combine it with (98) to get

$$\begin{aligned} |e^{-(s-\tau)A} F(\psi(\tau))| &\lesssim e^{(s-\tau)\frac{\gamma}{2}} y^{-\gamma} e^{-\lambda_l \tau} (Mf_1(y) + Mf_2(y) + Mf_3(y)) \\ &\leq e^{-\lambda_l s} y^{2\lambda_l} e^{-l(\tau - s_0)} (Mf_1(y) + Mf_2(y) + Mf_3(y)). \end{aligned}$$

We start with

$$\begin{aligned} Mf_1(y) &= \Gamma^{\gamma} \frac{\int_0^{\Gamma e^{-\omega_l \tau}} r^{\omega-1} e^{-r^2/4} dr}{\int_0^y r^{\omega+1} e^{-r^2/4} dr} \\ &\lesssim \Gamma^{\gamma} \int_0^{\Gamma e^{-\omega_l \tau}} r^{\omega-1} e^{-r^2/4} dr \end{aligned}$$

as long as $y \geq e^{(s-s_0)/2} \geq 1$. As before, we skip the exponential factor and approximate the last integral by $(\Gamma e^{-\omega_l \tau})^{\omega}$ to arrive at

$$Mf_1(y) \lesssim \Gamma^{\omega+\gamma} e^{-\omega\omega_l \tau} \leq \Gamma^{\omega+\gamma} e^{-\omega\omega_l s_0} = e^{\omega_l s_0 (k\theta(\gamma+\omega)-\omega)},$$

which decays with s_0 as long as

$$\theta < \frac{\omega}{k(\gamma+\omega)}.$$

This new condition for θ is superfluous to (100) where we already restricted θ by

$$\theta < \frac{k(\omega+2)-2}{k(\gamma+\omega)} < \frac{\omega}{k(\gamma+\omega)}.$$

Next comes Mf_2, for which we have

$$\begin{aligned} Mf_2(y) &\lesssim \Gamma^{-2\gamma} \frac{\int_0^y r^{\omega-1} e^{-r^2/4} dr}{\int_0^y r^{\omega+1} e^{-r^2/4} dr} \\ &\lesssim \Gamma^{-2\gamma} (1 + \mathcal{O}(y^{-2})) = e^{-2\gamma\omega_l k\theta} (1 + \mathcal{O}(y^{-2})) \end{aligned}$$

as long as $y \geq e^{(s-s_0)/2} \geq 1$ and the decay with s_0 is straight forward. For the last maximal function we get

$$\begin{aligned} Mf_3(y) &= e^{-(1-2\sigma)\lambda_l s}\frac{\int_y^\infty r^{2l+1+\omega}e^{-r^2/4}dr}{\int_y^\infty r^{1+\omega}e^{-r^2/4}dr} \\ &\lesssim y^{2l}e^{-(1-2\sigma)\lambda_l s} \leq y^{2l}e^{-(1-2\sigma)\lambda_l s_0} \leq e^{2l\sigma s}e^{-(1-2\sigma)\lambda_l s_0}. \end{aligned}$$

At this point we reuse (101) from Lemma VI.5, which puts a limit on s in terms of s_0 to get

$$Mf_3(y) \lesssim e^{\left(\frac{2l\sigma}{1-2\sigma}-(1-2\sigma)\right)s_0}.$$

At this point, we have to impose an additional condition on σ, namely Mf_3 decays with s_0 if

$$0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{10l}.$$

Again, this is compatible with the assumption $\sigma < \frac{1}{4}$ we made in Lemma VI.5, in fact the latter assumption is superfluous because $0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{10l} < \frac{1}{4}$ for all $l \geq 1$. □

VII. A PRIORI LONG TIME ESTIMATES

Lemma VII.1. *If $\psi \in \mathcal{W}^1_{s_0,s_1}$ and $P_{s_0,s_1}(q_n) = 0$ with $n = 0, 1, ..., \ell - 1$, then for any $R > 1$ there exists $\kappa > 0$ such that*

$$|\psi(s)(y) + e^{-\lambda_l s}\phi_l(y)| \lesssim C(R)e^{-\kappa s_0}e^{-\lambda_l s}y^{-\gamma}$$

for $Ke^{-\omega_l s} < y \leq R$ and $s > s_0 + 1$.

Proof. First, let us remind that $\psi(s) + e^{-\lambda_l s}\phi_l$ solves

$$\psi(s) + e^{-\lambda_l s}\phi_l = e^{-A(s-s_0)}(\psi_0 + e^{-\lambda_l s_0}\phi_l) + \int_{s_0}^{s} e^{-A(s-\tau)}f(\psi(\tau))\,d\tau. \tag{102}$$

It is convenient to divide the nonlinear part into the following two integrals:

$$\int_{s_0}^{s} e^{-A(s-\tau)}f(\psi(\tau))\,d\tau = \left(\int_{s_0}^{s-1} + \int_{s-1}^{s}\right) e^{-A(s-\tau)}f(\psi(\tau))\,d\tau$$

By arguments similar to ones used for the short-time estimates (see the proof of Lemma VI.7), the integral over $[s-1, s]$, denoted from now on as $\mathcal{I}$, already fulfills the proposed bounds, so we shall only consider the remaining integral over $[s_0, s-1]$. Let us now rewrite the right hand side of (102) in terms of projections onto eigenfunctions

$$\psi(s) + e^{-\lambda_l s}\phi_l = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\phi_n\left(e^{-\lambda_n(s-s_0)}\langle\psi_0 + e^{-\lambda_l s_0}\phi_l, \phi_n\rangle + \int_{s_0}^{s-1} e^{-\lambda_n(s-\tau)}\langle f(\psi(\tau)), \phi_n\rangle d\tau\right) + \mathcal{I}.$$

Exploiting the particular form of ψ_0 and the fact that $P_{s_0,s_1}(q_n) = 0$, we get

$$\psi(s) + e^{-\lambda_l s}\phi_l = -\sum_{n=0}^{l-1} \phi_n \int_{s-1}^{s_1} e^{-\lambda_n(s-\tau)} \langle f(\psi(\tau)), \phi_n \rangle \, d\tau \tag{103a}$$

$$- \phi_l e^{-\lambda_l s} \langle \widetilde{\phi}_l - \phi_l, \phi_l \rangle \tag{103b}$$

$$+ \sum_{n=l+1}^{\infty} \phi_n e^{-\lambda_n(s-s_0)} e^{-\lambda_l s_0} \langle \widetilde{\phi}_l - \phi_l, \phi_n \rangle \tag{103c}$$

$$+ \sum_{n=l+1}^{\infty} \phi_n \int_{s_0}^{s-1} e^{-\lambda_n(s-\tau)} \langle f(\psi(\tau)), \phi_n \rangle \, d\tau \tag{103d}$$

$$+ \mathcal{I}. \tag{103e}$$

Lemmas V.3 and V.2, along with the asymptotic behavior for eigenfunctions from Lemma III.4 imply the appropriate bounds for the terms (103a) and (103b); for example there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \phi_n \int_{s-1}^{s_1} e^{-\lambda_n(s-\tau)} \langle f(\psi(\tau)), \phi_n \rangle \, d\tau \right| &\lesssim e^{-\lambda_l s} y^{-\gamma} \alpha_n \int_{s-1}^{s_1} e^{-(\lambda_l - \lambda_n)(\tau - s)} e^{-\kappa\tau} \, d\tau \\ &\lesssim e^{-\kappa s} e^{-\lambda_l s} y^{-\gamma} \alpha_n e^{(\lambda_l - \lambda_n)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that $\lambda_l - \lambda_n > 0$ for $n \leq l-1$. The terms depending on n can be safely bounded by a single constant because the summation is over a finite range of n.

The third and fourth terms, (103c) and (103d), must be treated more carefuly—since the summation goes to infinity and thus an inefficient bound on the projections may simply diverge. As we shall see, the results proved in Lemmata V.3 and V.2 are sufficient as they lead to

$$\begin{aligned} |(103c)| &\lesssim y^{-\gamma} \sum_{n=l+1}^{\infty} \alpha_n e^{-\lambda_n(s-s_0)} e^{-\lambda_l s_0} e^{-\kappa s_0} \\ &= e^{-\kappa s_0} e^{-\lambda_l s} y^{-\gamma} \sum_{n=l+1}^{\infty} \alpha_n e^{-(\lambda_n - \lambda_l)(s-s_0)} \end{aligned} \tag{104}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |(103d)| &\lesssim y^{-\gamma} \sum_{n=l+1}^{\infty} \alpha_n \lambda_n \int_{s_0}^{s-1} e^{-\lambda_n(s-\tau)} e^{-\lambda_l \tau} e^{-\kappa\tau} \, d\tau \\ &\lesssim e^{-\kappa s} e^{-\lambda_l s} y^{-\gamma} \sum_{n=l+1}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_n \lambda_n}{\lambda_n - \lambda_l - \kappa} e^{-(\lambda_n - \lambda_l)}. \end{aligned} \tag{105}$$

The leading order coefficient, α_n, grows with n, but only algebraically, which is easily countered by the exponential decay of $e^{-(\lambda_n - \lambda_l)}$ as long as $s - s_0 \geq 1$; therefore the sums in (104) and (105) converge and the proof is complete. □

Lemma VII.2. *For any $\nu \in (0,1)$ there exists R and s_0 large enough so that*

$$|\psi_q(s)(y) + e^{-\lambda_l s}\phi_l(y)| \lesssim \nu e^{-\lambda_l s} y^{2\lambda_l}, \qquad R < y \leq e^{(s-s_0)/2}$$

as long as $s > s_0 + 1$.

Proof. Let us now fix $y > R$ and an intermediate time $\bar{s} \in [s_0, s-1]$, such that $e^{(s-\bar{s})/2} \leq y \leq 2e^{(s-\bar{s})/2}$ (for any $y \in [R, e^{(s-s_0)/2})$ it is possible to find such $\bar{s}$) and let us write $\psi_q(s)$ relative to $\psi_q(\bar{s})$ as

$$\psi_q(s) + e^{-\lambda_l s}\phi_l = e^{-A(s-\bar{s})}(\psi_q(\bar{s}) + e^{-\lambda_l \bar{s}}\phi_l) + \int_{\bar{s}}^{s} e^{-A(s-\tau)} F(\psi_q(\tau))\, d\tau.$$

In other words, we are using $\psi_q(\bar{s})$ as an initial data to get $\psi_q(s)$ for $s \geq \bar{s} + 1$. We then notice that the nonlinear term in the above expression can be bounded by the same logic as what led us to Lemma VI.8, once we replace s_0 there by $\bar{s}$. As a result, we obtain

$$\left| \int_{\bar{s}}^{s} e^{-A(s-\tau)} F(\psi_q(\tau))(y)\, d\tau \right| \lesssim e^{-\kappa \bar{s}} e^{-s\lambda_l} y^{-\gamma}, \qquad y \in [e^{(s-\bar{s})/2}, e^{\sigma s}).$$

Because $e^{-\kappa\bar{s}} \leq e^{-\kappa s_0}$ we have just produced the required bound for the nonlinear term.

As for the linear term, the previous Lemma, combined with the starting assumption on ψ_q guarantees that

$$|\psi_q(s)(y) + e^{-\lambda_l s}\phi_l(y)| \lesssim e^{-\lambda_l s} \begin{cases} e^{-\kappa s_0} C(R) y^{-\gamma} & y \leq R, \\ y^{2\lambda_l} & y > R. \end{cases} \tag{106}$$

In other words, we start with a bound that is already improved for $y \leq R$. Now observe that (106) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi_q(s) + e^{-\lambda_l s}\phi_l\|^2 &\lesssim e^{-2\lambda_l s} e^{-2\kappa s_0} C(R)^2 \int_0^R y^{-2\gamma+d-1}\, dy + e^{-2\lambda_l s} \int_R^\infty y^{4\lambda_l + d - 1} e^{-\frac{y^2}{4}}\, dy \\ &\lesssim e^{-2\lambda_l s}(e^{-2\kappa s_0} C_1(R) + C_2(R)). \end{aligned}$$

From the form of the integrals one can easily see that C_1 increases with R, while C_2 tends to zero with R. Thus for every $\nu \in (0,1)$ there exists $R = R(\nu)$ and $s_0 = s_0(R)$, both large enough, so that the sum $e^{-2\kappa s_0} C_1(R) + C_2(R)$ can be made smaller than ν, therefore

$$|\langle \psi_q(s) + e^{-\lambda_l s}\phi_l, \phi_n \rangle| \leq \|\psi_q(s) + e^{-\lambda_l s}\phi_l\| \lesssim \nu e^{-\lambda_l s}.$$

We immediately get

$$\begin{aligned}|e^{-A(s-\bar{s})}(\psi_q(\bar{s})+e^{-\lambda_l\bar{s}}\phi_l)(y)| &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda_n(s-\bar{s})}|\langle\psi_q(\bar{s})+e^{-\lambda_l\bar{s}}\phi_l,\phi_n\rangle||\phi_n(y)| \\ &\lesssim \nu\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda_n(s-\bar{s})}e^{-\lambda_l\bar{s}}\beta_n y^{2\lambda_n} \\ &= \nu e^{-\lambda_l s}y^{2\lambda_l}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\beta_n(ye^{-(s-\bar{s})/2})^{2\lambda_n-2\lambda_l}.\end{aligned}$$

It now suffices to show that the last sum converges and can be bounded independently of s. But this becomes evident from our choice of $\bar{s}$: we picked $\bar{s}$ such that $1 \leq ye^{-(s-\bar{s})/2} \leq 2$. We simply split the sum into two components containing either negative and positive powers of $(ye^{-(s-\bar{s})/2})$ to get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\beta_n(ye^{-(s-\bar{s})/2})^{2\lambda_n-2\lambda_l} &= \sum_{n=0}^{l}\beta_n(ye^{-(s-\bar{s})/2})^{2\lambda_n-2\lambda_l}+\sum_{n=l+1}^{\infty}\beta_n(ye^{-(s-\bar{s})/2})^{2\lambda_n-2\lambda_l} \\ &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{l}\beta_n+\sum_{n=l+1}^{\infty}\beta_n 2^{2\lambda_n-2\lambda_l}.\end{aligned}$$

Thanks to β_n behaving roughly as $n^{-\omega/4}4^{-n}/n!$ the last sum converges, while the first sum is is simply finite. □

Acknowledgments. The first author acknowledges financial support by the Sofja Kovalevskaja award of the Humboldt Foundation endowed by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research held by Roland Donninger. Partial support by the DFG, SFB 1060 is also gratefully acknowledged. The second author was partly supported by Grant-in-Aid for Research Activity Start-up (No. 6887027) and Kyushu University Interdisciplinary Programs in Education and Projects in Research Development (No. 2012DB4000).

---

[1] P. Biernat. Non-self-similar blow-up in the heat flow for harmonic maps in higher dimensions. *Nonlinearity*, 28(1):167, apr 2015. ISSN 0951-7715. doi:10.1088/0951-7715/28/1/167.

[2] P. Biernat and P. Bizoń. Shrinkers, expanders, and the unique continuation beyond generic blowup in the heat flow for harmonic maps between spheres. *Nonlinearity*, 24(8):2211–2228, aug 2011. ISSN 0951-7715. doi:10.1088/0951-7715/24/8/005.

[3] P. Bizoń and A. Wasserman. Nonexistence of shrinkers for the harmonic map flow in higher dimensions. apr 2014. doi:10.1093/imrn/rnu176.

[4] J. Eells and J. H. Sampson. Harmonic Mappings of Riemannian Manifolds. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 86(1):109, jan 1964. ISSN 00029327. doi:10.2307/2373037.

[5] H. Fan. Existence of the self-similar solutions in the heat flow of harmonic maps. *Science in China Series A: Mathematics*, 42(2):113–132, feb 1999. ISSN 1006-9283. doi:10.1007/BF02876563.

[6] P. Germain and M. Rupflin. Selfsimilar expanders of the harmonic map flow. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincare (C) Non Linear Analysis*, 28(5):743–773, sep 2011. ISSN 02941449. doi: 10.1016/j.anihpc.2011.06.004.

[7] J.-S. Guo and C.-C. Wu. Finite time dead-core rate for the heat equation with a strong absorption. *Tohoku Mathematical Journal, Second Series*, 60(1):37–70, 2008.

[8] M. A. Herrero and J. J. L. Velázquez. A blow-up result for semilinear heat equations in the supercritical case.

[9] M. A. Herrero and J. J. L. Velázquez. Singularity patterns in a chemotaxis model. *Mathematische Annalen*, 306(1):583–623, sep 1996. ISSN 0025-5831. doi:10.1007/BF01445268.

[10] M. A. Herrero and J. J. L. Velázquez. On the Melting of Ice Balls. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 28(1):1–32, jan 1997. ISSN 0036-1410. doi:10.1137/S0036141095282152.

[11] F. Lin and C. Wang. *The analysis of harmonic maps and their heat flows*. 2008. ISBN 9789812779526. doi:10.1142/9789812779533.

[12] A. Lunardi. *Analytic Semigroups and Optimal Regularity in Parabolic Problems*. Birkhauser, 1995.

[13] A. Lunardi. *Linear and nonlinear diffusion problems*. Number July. 2004. URL `http://www.math.unipr.it/{~}lunardi/LectureNotes/Cortona2004.pdf`.

[14] B. Muckenhoupt. Poisson Integrals for Hermite and Laguerre Expansions. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 139:231, may 1969. ISSN 00029947. doi:10.2307/1995316.

[15] F. W. J. Olver, D. W. Lozier, R. F. Boisvert, and C. W. Clark, editors. *NIST Handbook of Mathematical Functions*. National Institute of Standards and Technology, Maryland. URL `http://dlmf.nist.gov/`.

[16] M. H. Protter and H. F. Weinberger. *Maximum Principles in Differential Equations*. Springer New York, New York, NY, 1984. ISBN 978-1-4612-9769-7. doi:10.1007/978-1-4612-5282-5.

[17] P. Raphaël and R. Schweyer. Stable Blowup Dynamics for the 1-Corotational Energy Critical Harmonic Heat Flow. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 66(3):414–480, mar 2013. ISSN 00103640. doi:10.1002/cpa.21435.

[18] M. Reed and B. Simon. *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics II*.

[19] Y. SEKI. ON EXACT DEAD-CORE RATES FOR A SEMILINEAR HEAT EQUATION WITH STRONG ABSORPTION. *Communications in Contemporary Mathematics*, 13(01):1–52, feb 2011. ISSN 0219-1997. doi:10.1142/S0219199711004154.

[20] M. E. Taylor. *Partial Differential Equations III*, volume 117. 2011. ISBN 978-1-4419-7048-0. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4419-7049-7.

[21] J. B. van den Berg, J. R. King, and J. Hulshof. Formal Asymptotics of Bubbling in the Harmonic Map Heat Flow. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 63(5):1682–1717, jan 2003. ISSN 0036-1399. doi:10.1137/S0036139902408874.

[22] J. J. L. Velázquez. Stability of Some Mechanisms of Chemotactic Aggregation. *SIAM Journal on*

Applied Mathematics, 62(5):1581, 2002. doi:10.1137/S0036139900380049.